

Alexander I. Pereswetoff-Morath (Stockholm, Sweden)

‘THE OLD IS IN THE NEW REVEALED’: PROPHETICAL QUOTATIONS  
FROM THE SLAVONIC TRANSLATION OF *DOCTRINA IACOBI* IN THE  
LITERATURE OF EARLY KYIVAN RUS’\*

(Part one)

*In memoriam Sverker Holmstedt, 1939–2014*

*Vetus in novo patet.*  
Augustine of Hippo

Among the few extant literary texts of East Slavonic origin that can be dated to a time before c. 1120, at least two, Hilarion of Kyiv’s *Sermon on Law and Grace* (1037–1050) and the *Philosopher’s Speech* (probably before 1116) are engrossed with the theme of how the Christian ‘new people’ replaced the Jews, an older people elect thought to have fallen from God’s grace. The *Philosopher’s Speech* (henceforth I shall generally refer to this text as *Speech*) has come down to us as part of the *Tale of Bygone Years*, whereas Hilarion’s sermon is usually treated as a separate work in the textual tradition (the point where it ends varies, however). Whatever may have been their original context and purpose these texts broke the dam as they expanded on the perceived criminality of the Jews (exemplified, in Christian eyes, by rebukes of ‘the Jews’ in the books of the prophets) in connection with perceived prophecies of the birth, passion, death, and resurrection

---

\* Much of the research for this paper was done in 2011, when I was a participating fellow at the Israel Institute for Advanced Studies, Jerusalem, within the project *Cultural Archaeology of Jews and Slavs: Mediaeval and Early Modern Judaeo-Slavic Interaction and Cross-Fertilisation*. For the support of that fine institution I am very grateful. Two generous grants from the Åke Wiberg Foundation (grants 536016150 and H15-0250) allowed me to return to the material in 2014–2015 and to consult more manuscripts of the *Doctrina Iacobi*; for this, too, I offer my profound gratitude. I have profited from comments given at a presentation of a first germ of this study at a workshop in Jerusalem in June 2011 by B. A. Uspenskij, C. Zuckerman, and V. M. Živov (*lux aeterna luceat ei*), and later in August 2011 at a Jerusalem seminar, at which I presented a survey of the greater part of the scriptural passages discussed in the this paper. On the latter occasion, I was helped by incisive comments from A. A. Alekseev, A. Kulik, Y. Petrovsky-Shtern, and particularly M. Taube. He and W. F. Ryan have read a draft version of this paper, and for their comments I am grateful indeed. I am also pleasantly indebted to A. A. Selin for his help at the Russian State Historical Archive and to L. V. Moškova for precious information on the Nikiforov manuscript.

of the Messiah in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. It has been difficult to find a convincing *Sitz im Leben* for any particularly acute religious conflict between Jews and Christians in 11th – early 12th-century Rus' (Pereswetoff-Morath 2002 2: 83–101, 105–121)<sup>1</sup>. On the other hand, even though we can easily identify an anti-Judaic vein in the literature of *Slavia Slavonica* (to use S. Graciotti's term), it has not been possible to place the Sl. translations of the major Byzantine works against the Jews in such early times. As a result, we have been hard put to identify any sources that might have introduced the theme on a broader scale to the Orthodox Slavs by the early 12th century and influenced homiletics and chronicle writing. The only certain more or less distinct exception – if it can be called a 'major work' – has been one of John Chrysostom's sermons 'against the Jews', which was available from an early date in a 10th-century Bulgarian translation within the Chrysostomic florilegium *Zlatostruj*. However, the sermon seems never to have been disseminated outside the long redaction of that florilegium (Pereswetoff-Morath 2002 1: 71–75; cf. МИЛТЕНОВ 2013: 38, 545).

It is the argument of this paper that one more translated anti-Judaic treatise was available in *Slavia Slavonica* at the very latest in the first third of the 11th century<sup>2</sup>. The evidence will be looked for in the text form of quotations from the prophets in Hilarion and *Speech*. It has been noted in the scholarly literature that a number of these diverge from canonical biblical versions, but only in a few cases have their sources been identified. In order to decide when and where the quotations were imported from what source(s), we shall first have to discuss questions concerning the chronology of *a*) the books of the prophets in early *Slavia Slavonica*, *b*) the *Philosopher's Speech* – and, particularly, one of its sections – as part of the *Tale of Bygone Years*, and *c*) Hilarion's *Sermon on Law and Grace*. We shall then turn to the analysis proper. This will be mainly confined to Kyivan 11th-century evidence, but our findings may turn out to hold considerable import for South Slavia as well.

## PROPHETS

### *The availability of the books of the prophets in Kyivan Rus'*

Claims have been made that one or more collections of scriptural quotations, mainly from the prophets, on the rejection of the Jews and the calling of the gen-

---

<sup>1</sup> For recent treatments of Hilarion's sermon that place that work outside of a local Jewish-Christian conflict, see, e.g., Темчин 2007 and Pereswetoff-Morath 2014: 113–115; contrast Raba 2014: 83–92 (originally published in Hebrew in 2003). Also contrast Raba (2014: 54–134) on an early Rus' *Sitz im Leben* of sorts for anti-Jewish polemics. Taube (Taube 2012: 32–36) has culled some fascinating tidbits from the *Interpreted Palaia* tradition suggestive of 'a Jew converted to Christianity using Jewish sources to polemicize against his former coreligionists' in Rus', but this, if correct, occurred in post-Kyivan times.

<sup>2</sup> On a possible Rus' exception which was recently suggested by J. Reinhart, see our note in the second part of this paper. In the near future, some other, primarily SSL., examples will probably be shown to be rather early.

tiles were known early on in Orthodox Sl. literature but have since been lost. The evidence has been found in clusters of quotations in various texts with an anti-Judaic bias, where specific passages and, at times, their specific order appear to be repeated from text to text. In particular, attempts have been made to find an OCS Ur-text of these collections in the eight *besědy* ('conversations' or 'homilies') into which Methodios translated his brother Cyril-Constantine's disputation with Khazarian Jews in 861, if we are to believe the tenth chapter of the *Long Life of St. Constantine*. This is a line of inquiry which in recent decades has been pursued, in particular, by Ch. P. Trendafilov, who has pointed out numerous scriptural passages shared by the *Life* and a series of ancient texts, not least *Speech*<sup>3</sup>. This text the Bulgarian scholar believes to be a Moravian reflection of Constantine's disputation, possibly translated or authored by Methodios (Трендафилов 1999: 173–204). In so traditional a material, however, there is often similarity without genetic kinship, and no links between the two texts have been demonstrated on a textual level. This lessens the significance of the observations, acute though at times they are. In fact, if we are to assume that the depiction of the disputation in Cyril's *Life* reproduces the scriptural quotations of the lost Sl. *besědy*, we must conclude that the prophetic collection of *Speech* is not derived from them, as Johannes Reinhart recently showed (Reinhart 2008: 155; cf. Podskalsky 1982: fn 78; Pereswetoff-Morath 2002 1: 247–251).

A full Christian Bible as collected in a single ponderous codex was unknown to the East Slavs before the very late 15th century. Instead, the prophetic books of the Old Testament – a term used here for the *Tanakh* when a Christian context is at the centre of our attention – circulated in two main versions, that of the *prophetologion* and that of the *catenae*. Most probably there was also a third version, which has only come down to us in fragments. *a*) In the liturgical book known as the *prophetologion* or *paroimiarion*, lections from the Old Testament were arranged in accordance with the liturgical year. Represented was a very small portion of the Old Testament, including parts of the prophets, with an uncommonly high percentage of passages with a Christological potential. Their text was occasionally slightly edited in order for the lections to become self-contained. The *prophetologion* was almost certainly the first kind of Old Testament to be translated into Slavonic, and the extant translation is pre-Symeonic (Thomson 1998: 642–643, 719–720, 725–726, 846–849; cf. Алексеев 1999: 23–25; Miller 2013: 55–76; ГИМОН 2014: 590). *b*) The prophets were also known in the *catenae*, 'the chains', traditionally known as the *Interpreted Prophecies*. Here most prophetic books were accompanied by commentaries (Thomson 1998: 850–859; cf. Алексеев 1999: 33–34, 37, 163–165). On the whole, they are in a Symeonic translation, but four books, among them Zechariah and Malachi, are older and lack a commentary. They appear to go back – and this, *c*<sup>1</sup>), is the rare third text form – to an ancient complete translation of the minor prophets (with Daniel), at-

---

<sup>3</sup> For the pertinent passages in the *Life*, see: Ангелов, Кодов 1973: 98–100, 105.

tested also in Croatian Glagolitic lectionaries. There may be, *c*<sup>2</sup>), quite small traces of a postulated ancient complete translation of the major prophets as well, mainly in a 13th/14th-century ESL manuscript (Thomson 1998: 850–855; Алексеев 1999: 140–145, 154–156)<sup>4</sup>. Since this translation may still have been known in the 13th century, it can always be used as a scholarly wild-card with an assumption that it is the source of single passages from the prophets in otherwise unattested forms. As a rule, however, such claims are also impossible to prove. Apart from this potential item, even with the prophetologion and the catenae, which were the ordinary ‘donors’ of prophecies (and will in this paper be jointly referred to as the ‘received’ versions), an Orthodox Rus’ library was left without some important chunks of prophetic texts. Most notably, this included large parts of Jeremiah and smaller parts of some of the minor prophets. When Rus’ authors cite scripture in a text form coinciding with either of the two normally attested versions of the Old Testament we need usually not be concerned with tracing the specific sources further, because there can be no doubt that both the prophetologion and the catenae were known to the East Slavs from at least the 11th century. The problem, but also the prospect of identifying lost aspects of language, literature, and culture, arise when the quotation cannot be comfortably assigned to either.

#### *Prophecies from uncanonical sources*

As P. M. Stroeve observed in the 1820s, Rus’ annalists were prone to quote the Bible in versions that we no longer recognise. He suggested that scripture in such cases was cited from memory or with adjustments to a new context (Строев 1820: XXIII), or, when the relevant books were missing, from sources other than scripture proper, such as the chronicle of George the Monk (Hamartolos) (Строев 1828: 171). Much more recently, S. Franklin has observed that in the ‘compilations of compilations’ that was medieval Rus’ historiography (and, we may add, homiletics), quotations might ‘ostensibly refer to the Old Testament, but on closer inspection they turn out to have no exact parallel in the Bible. The apocryphal and the canonical seem to mingle without differentiation’ (Franklin 1982: 1–2). There are, in *Speech*, two prophecies ascribed to Ezra and Jeremiah that cannot be found in canonical scripture (on these, see below), while others differ markedly from the received Sl. versions. Borrowings which may be checked from a point outside the paradosis (i.e. the text tradition) of a specific text are always valuable since, in T. L. Vilkul’s words, they provide us with ‘control texts’ (Вилкул 2011: 269–278; Вилкул 2012: 5). Scriptural quotations can be particularly valuable in this connection since they may have been more reverentially preserved during copying. If, in addition, ancient *deviant* quotations are preserved, these have even greater evidential value.

---

<sup>4</sup> Contrast, e.g., the conclusion of the recent editors of the Sl. catenical Ezekiel that the existence of an ancient full translation of that book cannot be proved (Тасева, Йовчева 2003: 62–63). Cf. also below on some questionable pieces of Isaian evidence which have occasionally been adduced.

## KYIVAN TEXTS

### *The 'Tale of Bygone Years' and the 'Philosopher's Speech'*

The text known to scholarship as the *Philosopher's Speech* is part of the long entry for the year 6494 (986/987) in the *Tale of Bygone years* (also known as the *Primary Chronicle* or, conventionally, as *Nestor's Chronicle*). It is represented in all the text branches of *Tale* (as I shall generally call it), but also in the younger redaction of the *First Novgorod Chronicle (NPLml.)*. It consists of the long speech on, mainly, salvational history, pronounced by an anonymous Greek philosopher to Prince Volodimer of Kyiv as the latter has set out to find a new faith for himself and his people. The genesis of *Speech* has been a matter of scholarly debate for a long time, but J. Reinhart has demonstrated very convincingly that the text as we have it is an ESL work (Reinhart 2008: 151–170, with historiography and bibliography). The question of its dating, and particularly the dating of one of its parts, is of importance to us here but must be approached together with the dating of *Tale*.

In the most authoritative modern re-working of A. A. Šachmatov's reconstruction of the history of *Tale*, viz. that of the Moscow Slavist A. A. Gippius, *Tale* – the extant 'final' text of which is almost universally assigned to the 1110s and the town of Kyiv – builds on an earlier *Initial Compilation* (Ru. *Načal'nyj svod*)<sup>5</sup>. This in its turn is dated to the early 1090s and is, in part, independently preserved in *NPLml*. Very simply put, material common to the *Tale* and *NPLml.*, such as *Speech*, must, as a consequence of this '*Načal'nyj svod* theory', have been in existence by the 1090s. Earlier layers of the compilation are also reconstructed, and the most important for our discussion is the compilation of the 1060s, which was earlier dated to 1072 (see, e.g., Гиппиус 2012: 55–57, 61; cf. Müller 2006: 401–412). Against this general scheme we note today in particular the views of D. Ostrowski and T. L. Vilkul. Ostrowski, working with a stemma very dissimilar from that/those of Šachmatov, does away with the reconstructed *Initial Compilation* and generally does not concern himself with what came before the final 1116 text of *Tale* (the  $\alpha$  of his stemma). In his view, *NPLml.* is dependent upon the *Tale*, and stemmatic work cannot take us further back than this year (cf. Ostrowski et al., especially XXXIV–XXXV, XXXVIII–XXXIX, LXI–LXII, LXIV; Ostrowski 2007: 302–304)<sup>6</sup>. Vilkul, too, argues forcefully and ingeniously that there was no such thing as an initial compilation<sup>7</sup>, nor were several redactions made in the 1110s (as is usually reconstructed) but only one single authorial redaction at some time after 1114. As a consequence, she has much of the *Tale* penned in the 1110s or thereabouts that has usually been judged to be of earlier origin (e.g.

---

<sup>5</sup> We shall not be concerned here with Šachmatov's postulated *Ancient compilation* (in Russian: *Drevnejšij svod*), which might have placed the *Philosopher's Speech* in the late 1030s but which today has comparatively few scholarly supporters.

<sup>6</sup> Against Ostrowski, see, in particular, Gippius 2014: 342–361; cf. also the argumentation in Гиппиус 2002: 72–87.

<sup>7</sup> Ostrowski 2007: 269, surprisingly lists her among the supporters of the *Načal'nyj svod* theory.

Вилкул 2003: 5–35; Вилкул 2007b: 58; Вилкул 2012: 14–15)<sup>8</sup>. In particular she argues – on account of the use made of the chronicles of George the Monk and John Malalas (and this is one of the main arguments in her reconstruction) – that *Speech*, too, was created by the compiler of the ‘ethno-geographical’ introduction and the 6624/1114 article of *Tale*, i.e., in her understanding, the author of *Tale* (Вилкул 2007a: 88–89; Вилкул 2012: 13–14; cf. Вилкул 2007b: 58, fn 71). While in 2006, Gippius concluded that Vilkul’s 2003 argument did not treat the core evidence for the *Initial compilation* (Гиппиус 2006: 60), I am unaware of a response as yet to the evidence adduced in her subsequent papers. It should be noted, however, that, not least with the linguistic observations recently adduced (Гиппиус 2001: 147–180; Гиппиус 2009: 250–268), the manifold strands of evidence that support the hypothesis of an initial compilation are impressive.

### *The prophetic collection in the ‘Philosopher’s Speech’*

At the centre of the argument that will be made here, however, is a collection of quotations from the prophets which comprises only a minor part of *Speech*, corresponding to 98,4–102,2 in the interlinear edition of Ostrowski et al. (reproducing the column and line numbers of E. F. Karskij’s 1926 edition of the Laurentian chronicle in the first volume of *Полное собрание русских летописей*). It is here we find the two deviant quotations already mentioned. The collection consists of perceived prophecies on salvational history, namely the rejection of the Jews (beginning at 98,7), the calling of the Christians (at 99,10), the incarnation of Christ (at 100,2), his passion (at 100,29) and resurrection (at 101,14). In a seminal 2001 paper, Gippius demonstrated that this is an interpolation in *Speech* (Гиппиус 2001: 159–160, but compare also 153, 167–168). This was shown textually, since the interpolation has, to all appearances, been made mid-sentence in an older text. Just as importantly, however, it was demonstrated linguistically from the distribution of sigmatic (e.g. *rešša*) versus ‘new’ (‘erweiterte’ etc.; e.g. *rekoša*) aorists, as well as of other forms of the verb *rešti/reči*<sup>9</sup>. To Gippius’s arguments may be tentatively added the fact that this collection of prophecies largely coincides with part of a separate text whose series of prophecies, crucially, begins identically (with Hos 1:4–6) but is longer and probably not derived from *Speech* (as I shall demonstrate in a coming paper). This is the so-called *Prophecy of Isaiah* (properly, *Prophecy of Hosea*, but the title has been corrupted)<sup>10</sup>. The

<sup>8</sup> Vilkul does not exclude the possibility of *some* earlier compilations having found their way into the *Tale* (see Вилкул 2003: 35).

<sup>9</sup> A scholarly exchange followed between O. B. Strakhova and A. A. Gippius on the pages of *Palaeoslavica*. For our purposes, Gippius’s argument stands even after this, no matter that some details of the larger thesis of his paper have been slightly modified.

<sup>10</sup> Пррство Ісхину [for Усино – А.Р.-М.] пррка в вѣрзжєньи жидовъ, the sole known manuscript of which has probably not survived (cf. Pereswetoff-Morath 2006: 38, fn 87); the present writer has prepared an edition of the parts of it that were quoted in scholarship before the manuscript was lost. Šachmatov regarded this text as a representative of the *Interpreted Palaia* (*Толковая палея*)

similarities were first noted by Šachmatov (Шахматов 1904: 211, 242–245), even though he was unable to define the interpolation as exactly as did the modern scholar<sup>11</sup>. With slightly less evidence, Gippius (Гиппиус 2001: 176) suggests that another salient anti-Judaic passage in *Speech* may also have been introduced into the text on the same occasion, with the result that the anti-Judaic tendency (‘направленность’) which is usually ascribed to *Speech* as a whole is in fact a characteristic only of interpolations made at one particular stage in the composition of the *Initial compilation*<sup>12</sup>.

In 2001, pending further analysis, Gippius would not commit to whether the prophetic interpolation was made when *Speech* was added to the chronicle or if this happened in a subsequent compilation preceding the creation of *Tale* (Гиппиус 2001: 160). More recently, however, he has placed *Speech* in the reconstructed ‘compilation of 1072’ (which he has later redated to the beginning of the 1060s). At this stage, in his view, the story of the Rus’ for the first time explicitly entered into biblical genealogical history. Two interpolations in *Speech*, on the other hand, including the prophetic, were inserted only in the *Primary compilation* of the beginning of the 1090s as one of several items representing the Rus’ not as an ancient Japhethic tribe, but as a people elect of the latter days, in a way reminiscent of Hilarion’s *Sermon* with its insistence on a ‘new people’ (Гиппиус 2008: 20, 22; Гиппиус 2012: 54–55, 60–2; cf. Гиппиус 2006: 92; the scheme is followed by Михеев 2011: 203, 231).

As far as the dating of the prophetic collection is concerned we are left, in Gippius’s scheme, with an undefined pre-1090s origin if a pre-existing text was used, or with the 1090s if it was the work of the ‘initial compiler’. In Vilkul’s, and presumably, Ostrowski’s, scenario it is reasonable to assume that the *Speech* as such was present in the 1110s chronicle text (and, at least in Vilkul’s view, probably written only then). If, however, we accept, as I think we must, the secondary

---

tradition, believing that the *Palaia* had been partly incorporated into *Speech* (Шахматов 1904: 211; against this, see, e.g., Истрин 1906: 204–205). Discussing biblical quotations in *Speech*, Reinhart (Reinhart 2008: 159–160) refers to the *The Prophecy of Isaiah/Hosea* as a Kyivan manuscript of the *Interpreted prophets* (Ru. *Толковые пророчества*) and equates it with the catenical translation of the prophets. This misunderstanding may have been caused by Šachmatov’s referring to the text as *Толкование пророчеств* (Шахматов 1904: 216, compare also 211).

<sup>11</sup> Šachmatov, too, had recognised on a general level that *Speech* can be divided into several parts, the sources of which may not coincide. One of the four parts which he singled out contained („заключа[ла] в себе“) Old Testament prophecies (Шахматов 1940: 146), and it may have been identical to one of the chunks of text derived, in his view, from the *Palaia* (compare footnote 10 above), and also, largely, with the passage singled out by Gippius. Cf. also S. Schwarzband, partly following the lead of Lichačev and, ultimately, Šachmatov: „пророчества“ и „евангельская история“ [в Речи Философа – А.Р.-М.] были самостоятельно сочинены [на Руси – А.Р.-М.] по примеру чужих „учительных проповедей“ (Шварцбанд 1989: 135, but compare also 133). Since the prophecies are not from the *Palaia*, however, this particular piece of evidence does not show that the prophetic part of *Speech* originated in Rus’.

<sup>12</sup> Subsequently, Gippius has treated the status of the two passages as interpolations as being equally proved.

origin of the prophetic collection, it is less certain where such schemes take us, the more so if we are correct in thinking (see below) that the collection contains quotations from the chronicle of George the Monk. While not excluding the possibility that Vilkul's analysis is correct, I shall here, for reasons that will become obvious, mainly follow Gippius's analysis. Yet I am not, I think, dependent upon it in my main conclusions.

### *Hilarion's sermon and its quotations from the prophets*

Moving back in time to Hilarion and his *Sermon on Law and Grace* we are on safer ground. While the attribution of the sermon is, technically, hypothetical, it has been accepted by almost all scholars for the last 180 years; and even if the attribution should be incorrect, the dating still stands. The sermon was pronounced in or near Kyiv at some time between 1037 and 1050, but most scholars today prefer a date in the last years of the 1040s<sup>13</sup>. Its status as the oldest known original ESL literary work (e.g. Турилов 2009: 123) does not mean that Hilarion did not make use of earlier sources. On the contrary, this splendid work is, in many parts, highly traditional and the parallels to the sermon in translated theological and liturgical texts are very many, as we see from the commentaries in the apparatuses of L. Müller's and K. K. Akent'ev's analytical editions. There has, in addition, always remained a possibility that the author made use of original sources in Greek as well (Thomson 1983: 65–66, 73).

### TEXTUAL LINKS: THE FINDINGS OF LUDOLF MÜLLER AND O. V. TVOROGOV *An ancient Spruchsammlung*

The modern editions which show the greatest interest in the exact wording of scriptural and other quotations in *Speech* and Hilarion, L. Müller's translation of *Tale* (Müller 2001: 1–366), based on his own reconstruction of its text<sup>14</sup>, and K. K. Akent'ev's diplomatic edition of the oldest manuscript<sup>15</sup> of the first redaction of Hilarion's *Sermon* (Акентьев 2005: 122–152; also incorporating most of the source observations in Müller's 1962 edition), both note in their commentaries that their respective text has several quotations from the prophets that appear to be taken from unknown patristic sources. This notwithstanding, having meticulously analysed specific scriptural quotations, even Müller decides on several occasions that Hilarion and *Speech* must originally have had less deviant texts, and the German scholar thus – and as we shall see, sometimes unwarrantedly – translates over-idealised versions of the two works.

---

<sup>13</sup> See, e.g., the discussion in Müller 1962: 29–32; Franklin 1991: XX–XXI; Турилов 2009: 123. A notable exception is A. N. Užankov, who argues for a date in 1038 (Ужанков 2014: 11–39).

<sup>14</sup> Müller's 2001 translation should now be read together with his corrections in Müller 2006: 412–434.

<sup>15</sup> In fact, the single extant complete manuscript of the first redaction, namely State Historical Museum (Moscow), Син. 591. On the general superiority of its text, see Молдован 1984: 30–32; Молдован 2002–2003: 441–450.

Not only, however, do single quotations in the two texts exhibit surprising traits. There appear to be also some link between how they are put to use and in what constellations. In 1962, Müller noted that Hilarion and *Tale* – the passage in question is in the prophetic collection in *Speech* – partly made use of the same scriptural quotations on the supersession of the Jews (at 31,26–34,5 in Müller 1962; cf. Аке́нтьев 2005: 134–136). He also observed, however, that the theme had always been popular in Christian literature and that the texts were probably not immediately linked (Müller 1962: 155). His suspicions were aroused more, then, by the quaintness of Hilarion’s attributing one Isaian quotation to the prophet but not the two immediately preceding Isaian passages in a section on the fulfilment of the prophecies about ‘us’/the Christians (at 36,24–37,5 in Müller 1962; Аке́нтьев 2005: 139–140)<sup>16</sup>. He therefore posited that the first quotation had been taken over from some collection of scriptural passages (apparently with unsatisfactory attributions). In this connection he also noted that the *Life of Constantine* and *Tale* made use of identical passages (‘immer wieder die gleichen Bibelstellen’), which fact, he appears to have thought, supported the existence of such a collection (Müller 1962: 159)<sup>17</sup>. In a later work he noted that beginning at the series of Isaian quotations in Hilarion was a tiresome cluster of fifteen ‘schmucklos aneinandergereihten Sprüchen’ on universal salvation, which might once have constituted a separate anti-Judaic *Spruchsammlung* not necessarily compiled by the future metropolitan but incorporated, and possibly slightly edited, by him (Müller 1971: 13–15, compare also 40–41, 71–72)<sup>18</sup>. Well into his work

---

<sup>16</sup> Cf. quotation no. 6 in our analysis (in the second part of this paper).

<sup>17</sup> As we have seen, however, the quotations in the two latter works are not related on a textual level.

<sup>18</sup> This cluster, at the end and beginning of which are quotations nos 11 and 10 below (in the second part of this paper), is in Müller 1962 at 36,24–38,1; Молдован 1984: 90–91; Аке́нтьев 2005: 139–141. Müller’s prescient words are worth quoting at some length, since they will be in part vindicated in this paper: ‘Ihrem [der *Spruchsammlung* – *A.P.-M.*] literarischen Charakter nach ist sie eher ein theologischer Traktat als eine Festrede. Sammlungen von Bibelsprüchen zu dem Thema der Verwerfung des ursprünglich erwählten Volkes Israel und der Berufung des Christentums, das berufen ist, *allen* Völkern das Heil zu bringen, finden wir in verschiedenen Werken der frühen slavischen Literatur: in der Vita des Konstantin-Kyrill, in der Tolkovaja Paleja, in der Nestorchronik. Vielleicht haben solche *Spruchsammlungen* auch selbständig existiert und sind dann in verschiedenem Zusammenhang exzerpiert worden. Die hier vorliegende Sammlung braucht nicht unbedingt von Ilarion selbst zusammengestellt zu sein: wie er das nicht von ihm stammende, sondern allbekannte Nizänokonstantinopolitanische Glaubensbekenntnis in seine „Gesammelten Werke“ aufgenommen hat, so könnte er es auch mit einer solchen „*Spruchsammlung*“ getan haben. Möglicherweise hat er sie neu redigiert, einiges weggelassen, einiges hinzugefügt oder den Wortlaut einiger Zitate geändert’ (Müller 1971: 15). Hryniewicz saw it differently, thinking that the prophecies were a late insertion, even though he would not categorically claim that they had *not* been added by Hilarion himself as he edited his texts at a later point (Hryniewicz 1995: 223–224). However, Hryniewicz had misunderstood A. M. Moldovan’s analysis, to which he refers and which, in effect, he partly tacitly quotes (see Moldovan 1984: 11–14). The insertion discussed by Moldovan is *not* the fifteen prophecies (a number Hryniewicz still repeats here in words this time clearly replicating Müller), but the insertion in the sermon’s third redaction of passages coinciding with parts of the prophetic collection in *Speech*, which clearly have nothing to do with Hilarion’s authorial text. This is the insertion noted

on editing the *Tale of Bygone Years*, he returned to the question and observed that the quotations in a 18-line section of *Speech* are all reproduced in Hilarion as well<sup>19</sup>, and, crucially, both have a quotation from Is 42:9 followed by Is 65:15 – in *Speech* in immediate succession, in Hilarion separated by a mere и пакы ('and again'), acknowledging the new passage<sup>20</sup>. The quotations are textually almost identical in the two works, yet are slightly abbreviated in different ways. This, as Müller acutely observed, went to show that neither text was based on the other, but they both had a common source in *Slavonic* which, furthermore, consisted of or contained a thematical *Spruchsammlung*, a collection of prophecies from the Old Testament on the rejection of the Jews and the calling of the gentiles. Müller then obliquely suggests – and here we cannot follow him – that this might have been Constantine's lost *besědy* (Müller 1988–1989: 344).

### *Isaiah in Hilarion and 'Speech'*

More recently, in a paper briefly analysing quotations from Isaiah in *Speech*, the late O. V. Tvorogov came to the conclusion that, in his use of Isaiah, the compiler of *Speech* (more properly: the compiler of the collection of prophecies in *Speech*) turned mainly to the catenae. Still, an analysis of other quotations has shown influence from the prophetologion as well, suggesting that recourse was had to both of the received translations available in Kyivan Rus' (Творогов 2005: 132–133<sup>21</sup>; cf. Reinhart 2008: 160). However, among the fourteen Isaian quotations discussed by Tvorogov there were ten (!) that did not mesh comfortably with either translation<sup>22</sup>; indeed, some of them were markedly deviant. Furthermore, in five of these there was an affinity with quotations in Hilarion's sermon. The scholar noted that the deviant quotations „по характеру своему словно бы указывают на обращение ... к тексту ТП [Толковых Пророчеств, i.e. the prophetic catenae – *A.P.-M.*] иной переводческой ориентации“ (Творогов 2005: 132). This, he argues, might have pointed to a non-Rus' origin of *Speech*, were it not for the striking concurrences with Hilarion. However, the small number of samples did not allow Tvorogov to draw any further conclusions as to the identity of this unknown source or the geographical origin of *Speech*<sup>23</sup>.

---

by Gorskij (Горский 1844: 289), Suchomlinov (Сухомлинов 1908: 61–62), and Ždanov (Жданов 1904: 11–12); it is edited in Молдован 1984: 166–169, and I shall return to it in a coming study.

<sup>19</sup> This is almost the entire segment on the calling of the Christians in *Speech* (Ostrowski et al.: 99, 10–27). Müller was not quite correct, however, since two of the quotations – Jer 38(31):31, 33 (quotation no. 3 below) and Is 56:7 (quotation no. 2 below) – are not in Hilarion's sermon.

<sup>20</sup> This is our quotation no. 11 (in the second part of this paper).

<sup>21</sup> I am grateful to C. Zuckerman, Paris, for first drawing my attention to this important paper.

<sup>22</sup> As Tvorogov points out (Творогов 2005: 129), Evsěev's tendency, in his seminal 1897 study of the Sl. Isaiah, to define Isaian quotations in Hilarion and *Speech* in terms of either the prophetologion or the catena often made him ignore traits that point in neither direction.

<sup>23</sup> V. S. Savel'ev's recent survey of borrowings in *Tale* notes similarities in the collection of prophecies with the dialogue of Silvester of Rome and the Jew Zambri as recounted in the chronicle of George the Monk but has to conclude that these are due to the fact that the two works have

*'Other books'*

We see, then, without adducing at this point other sources, that there are traces in early Kyivan writings of at least one collection of anti-Judaic (or pointedly supersessionist) quotations from the prophets. This collection, which we shall call *Spruchsammlung*, apparently made use of the catenical text, the liturgical text of the prophetologion, and at least one other source in Slavonic. This third source or sources provided partly unique translations from the prophets, which may at times have had another textual basis than the received Sl. versions. (These in turn were based on Gk. texts from different branches of the Septuagint tradition.) This translated source – and I shall conventionally use the singular, even though there may have been more than one – has not been identified and might be a text which is either completely unknown or lost, or not commonly thought to date from these early times.

The *Spruchsammlung* might be what Hilarion has in mind when he writes (and we note the ambiguous grammatical number of *kōnigy*):

еже поминати въз писаніи семь и прѣрчьскаа проповѣданіа о хѣъ. и апѣльскаа оученіа въ бжѣдѣщїимъ вѣщѣъ. то излиха естъ. и на тѣщеславїе сзкланнагася. — Е же во въз ииѣ книгѣ писано и вами вѣдомо. ти сдѣ положити. то дрззостн вбразъ естъ и славохотїю. — Ни кѣ невѣдѣщїимъ бо пишемъ. нѣ прѣвизлиха насъштышемса сладости книжныа. не кѣ врагомъ бжїемъ иновѣрнымъ. нѣ самѣмъ сномъ его (Акентьев 2005: 124; cf. Müller 1962: 62–63; my emphasis – *A.P.-M.*)<sup>24</sup>.

In his oft-quoted 1872 dissertation on Hilarion's sermon, I. N. Ždanov (Жданов 1908: 11–12) understood these 'other book(s)' to be 'такія писанія, въ которыхъ только и поминались (т.е. излагались) апостольскія ученія о будущемъ вѣкѣ и пророческія проповѣданія о Христѣ', namely 'толкованія ветхозавѣтныхъ и новозавѣтныхъ писаній', in which we should find 'рѣчи пророковъ только въ объясненіяхъ христіанскихъ богослововъ'. (We may contrast Müller (1962: 149), who is inclined to identify the 'book(s)' of this passage with the interpreted catenical prophets.) However that may be, and whether or not the quotations that interest us here are a mere extract from the very book(s) Hilarion has said he will *not* quote, and whether or not he added them only at a second stage, the hypothetical source must have preceded the last authorial redaction of Hilarion's sermon. (We shall see, however, that quotations from this source were in fact more integral to the sermon than Müller thought and not limited only to this not fully integrated series of prophecies.)

---

common „тематические блоки“ (Савельев 2014: 131; cf. in the edition of George: Матвеевко, Щеголева 2006 1: 508–516). On this text within a text, see Темчин 2010: 29, 34–36.

<sup>24</sup> In S. Franklin's translation: 'Yet it is superfluous, verging even on vanity, to recall in this work either the preaching of the prophets concerning Christ or the teaching of the apostles concerning the age to come. It is a type of presumptuousness and vaingloriousness to set forth here *that which is written in other books and is known to you*. For we do not write for the ignorant, but for them that have feasted to fulfillment on the sweetness of books! Not for the heterodox, nor for the enemies of God, but for His very sons!' (Franklin 1991: 4, my emphasis – *A.P.-M.*)

*Enter Jacob, a recently baptised Jew*

In 2006, as a first step towards solving this riddle, I identified a borrowing within the prophetic compilation in *Speech* as deriving from the Sl. translation of the Byzantine *Teaching of Jacob, the Recently Baptised Jew* (in Muscovy generally known simply as the *Book (of) Jacob the Jew* [Книга Яковъ жидовинъ]; henceforth: *Doctrina* or *Doctrina Iacobi*) (Pereswetoff-Morath 2006: 23–28; Пересветов-Мурат 2008)<sup>25</sup>. This was allegedly a quotation from the prophet Ezra<sup>26</sup>, but its non-scriptural origin had been acknowledged at least since Stroeв's days (Строев 1820: 72, fn 10), while its source had remained a mystery (e.g. Müller 2001: 124). It turned out to be relatively stable in the chronicle transmission, and even a somewhat anomalous genitive = accusative<sup>27</sup> in 'спасъ Иерусалима' (the past active participle *спасъ* is at times reinterpreted as an l-participle and, at least in *L*, even as a noun) was kept in almost the entire paradosis. The texts of the *Tale* and the *Doctrina* coincided even in this grammatical trait, indicating that

<sup>25</sup> This observation was made shortly before the 2006 book was sent to the printer, and, as a result, its repercussions on the chronology of the Sl. *Doctrina Iacobi* were not fully incorporated in the main scheme of the book. In some previous scholarship in English, including that of the present writer, *Doctrina Iacobi nuper baptizati* has occasionally been referred to as *Teaching(s) of Jacob*, but I shall here use the name common in international scholarship on texts 'against the Jews'. The *Doctrina* is no. 7793 in M. Geerard's *Corpus Christianorum. Clavis patrum Graecorum*. In Sl. tradition it is occasionally known as *Faith and resistance of those among the Jews that were baptised in Africa, at Carthage* (Вѣра и противление крестившихся ѿ поудѣи въ Африкии въ Карфагении).

<sup>26</sup> *Speech*: Ездра же рече: „Благословенъ Богъ, распростъръ руцъ свои, съпасъ Иерусалима“ (*Ost.* 101,12–13. *Variant readings*: распростъръ *LRAHNcNt*: распростъръ *X*; распр. руцъ *HXNcNt*: руцъ распр. *LRA*; съпасъ *LRANcNt*: сѣлъ *HX*; свои сп. *LHXNcNt*: сп. свои *RA*; *RA* adds изъ before ѿрлма; Иерусалима *AXNcNt*: ѿрлма *R*: omitted in *L*). Cf. in the Sl. *Doctrina* (manuscript call numbers and abbreviations for editions given in full in the technical commentary at the end of this part of the paper): ѿкоже ѣ распатыи въ хс. едръ\* глеть, блвенъ гъ въ распростърыи ржцъ свои, и спасъ иерлѣма (*RGIA3760*, fo. 33r; \* the supralinear *z* has been scored out at a later point; распатыи: пропатыи *TSL91*, *RGADA93*, Vol.5/8; *TSL91*, *RGADA93*, Vol.5/8 omit the second бз; распростърыи *RGADA93*: распростеръ *TSL91*, Vol.5/8; Vol.5/8 adds и after распростеръ; ржцъ *TSL91*, Vol.5/8: рѣци *RGADA93*; *TSL91* omits и), and in the Gk.: Ὅτι δὲ Θεός ἐστιν ὁ σταυρωθεὶς Χριστός, Ἔσδρας λέγει: «Εὐλογητός Κύριος ὁ ἐκπετάσας τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ καὶ σώσας τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ» (*Dér.* I,33). The wording is perfectly preserved in *NPLml*, whereas ms *L* on one hand and mss *RA* on the other have reinterpreted, each in its own way, the participial construction. Incidentally, the quotation from Deut 28:66 which precedes the agraphon in both texts, separated from it only by a very short Isaian passage, is also almost certainly a borrowing from *Doctrina* (Pereswetoff-Morath 2006: 25, fn 27), but its relative commonality makes it less salient evidence. Savel'ev (Савельев 2014: 74), in his recent survey of the sources of *Tale*, erroneously believes that my 2008 paper deals only with 'общие места' in *Doctrina* and *Speech* and not with an actual influence.

<sup>27</sup> Proper nouns signifying collectives of people could take the genitive-accusative in OCS, e.g. *pomilueši Siona*; *položu Vavilona pusta* (quoted from Meillet 1897: 29); cf. in the Croatian breviary version of Zech 1:12: до колъ не имаши помовати Ереѣма и градъ Иудовъ (Vajs 1915: 7, where numerous other examples with this proper noun in the genitive-accusative may be found). Apart from this, however, almost any verb with general accusative transitivity, at least in OESL, might occasionally take objects in the genitive (Крысько 2006: 205).

copyists of both works could approach the prophecies in a rather careful manner, possibly because the text could not be corrected from canonical sources, nor could familiar liturgical pericopes influence the pen<sup>28</sup>. This certainly meant that the *Doctrina Iacobi* had been translated by the time that the recensions attested by the extant manuscripts of the *Tale* split, which, although dependent on which text critical scheme we follow, would make it older than the early 12th century at the very least, possibly even the 1090s. Still, the extent to which the text of the *Doctrina* would have been known in Kyivan Rus' remained unknown. Equally unknown, in the end, was the time when it, or chunks of it, entered ESL letters<sup>29</sup>.

The prolix Sl. *Doctrina Iacobi*, a translation of a 7th-century Byzantine text which is one of the jewels in the thorny crown of Byzantine anti-Judaic treatises<sup>30</sup>, purports to record a several-days-long disputation between the recently baptised Jacob and his Jewish former co-religionists in seventh-century Carthage. During this discussion, the former rowdy Jacob musters some 300 quotations from the Tanakh in defence of his new faith, which eventually results in conversions<sup>31</sup>. The Sl. version<sup>32</sup> is preserved only in comparatively late copies. Among the ca. 30 manuscripts known to date, the earliest is from the beginning of the 15th century, but at least an additional five more or less complete 15th-century copies are extant (Турилов 2000: 256; Pereswetoff-Morath 2002 1: 169–170)<sup>33</sup>. To be sure, such a state of affairs does not mean that the translation may not be older by far, as we see, for example, from the several Bulgarian 9th–10th-century translations extant only in 15th–16th-century Muscovite copies (e.g. Турилов 2012: 199–219, but neither do such counterexamples automatically mean that unexamined late texts are much older than their preserved manuscripts.

---

<sup>28</sup> The prophetic quotations in Hilarion's sermon, to which we shall return presently, are also relatively stable in the manuscript tradition (Молдован 1984: 13).

<sup>29</sup> The identification was made before Reinhart demonstrated that *Speech*, in the form in which we have it, is an ESL compilation (Reinhart 2008: 162–165) and before I was aware of Gippius's (Гиппиус 2001) findings on *Speech*. At the time, following A. S. L'vov's and N. H. Trunte's analyses of that work as a SSL text, I therefore concluded only that *Doctrina* was available in *South Slavia* by the early 12th century, but that more work was needed on the time and place of its translation (Pereswetoff-Morath 2006: 27; Pereswetoff-Morath 2007: 57–58). As we shall see, we can, technically, not locate the *entire* book of *Doctrina Iacobi* in Kyivan Rus', only *extracts* from it. There is, however, as will be clear from our analysis of the *Sermon on Law and Grace*, no longer any reason to be particularly cautious as to the earliest attested existence of the collection of prophecies in *Speech* in Kyivan Rus'.

<sup>30</sup> Edited by Vincent Déroche in Dagron, Déroche 1991: 47–273.

<sup>31</sup> For this number and further on the scriptural quotations in the Gk. *Doctrina*, see Déroche in Dagron, Déroche 1991: 256–9.

<sup>32</sup> The Sl. translation has been published only from the mid-16th-century Macarian *Великие минеи четви* (Великие Минеи Четви 1907: coll. 1438–1542), whose text belongs to a branch with many peculiar traits, including several late additions. It is not quoted in this paper.

<sup>33</sup> To the early manuscripts mentioned in these works must now be added a compendium (сборник-конволют) at the Russian State Library (Moscow): f. 199 (собр. Н. П. Никифорова), no. 367, fos 3–61. The part of the compendium containing the *Doctrina* is from the last third of the 15th century (L. V. Moškova, personal communication, December 2015).

*Attempts at dating the Slavonic 'Doctrina'*

ESl. echoes or (probably mediated) borrowings from the book, even preceding the late-15th-century–early-16th-century Muscovite heresy-hunters and the Ruthenian mid-15th-century (?) polemicists, were identified by me in the so-called Ukrainian branch of the *Life of St Andrew the Fool*, first known in a manuscript from the 1410s and thought by its editor A. M. Moldovan to originate only somewhat earlier (Pereswetoff-Morath 2006: 28–29, 51–53, 59–67). Partly identical traces were found in the apocalyptic last sections of the *Prophecy of Isaiah/Hosea* and some other related texts (cf. on the *Prophecy* fn 10 above). A short borrowing, which ultimately comes from the *Doctrina*, was also detected by me in the 13th–15th-century *Sayings of the Holy Prophets (Словеса святыхъ пророкъ)* (for historiography and various datings, see Pereswetoff-Morath 2002: 42–50; Водолазкин 2005: 293–296, 309; Pereswetoff-Morath 2006: 36–41, 43–44). On the other hand, the influence from *Doctrina* in manuscripts of the Sl. *Life of Gregentios* (in Sl. tradition *Gregorios*) of *Taphar*, which once seemed to place the *Doctrina* on Mt Athos in the late 14th century, has turned out to be confined to a late addition to the text (Pereswetoff-Morath 2002 1: 174–175; contrast Pereswetoff-Morath 2006: 29–30).

Even though the Sl. *Doctrina* has rarely been at the centre of scholarly attention, several attempts at dating the translation have been made. Datings to the turn of the 15th/16th centuries (Берунов 1963: 293; repeated in works by J. Howlett and C. De Michelis) can be discarded from what has already been demonstrated (Pereswetoff-Morath 2002 1: 172–173, with references). Much earlier datings have also been proposed but on non-existent or insufficient evidence. It has thus been stated that A. V. Gorskij and K. I. Nevostruev claimed the translation to have been made by a Serb in the 11th century (Прохоров 2003: 326). However, this is a misunderstanding. The two scholars refuted the view that another text (the pseudo-Damascene *O os'mi častech' slova*), copied together with *Doctrina* in one 16th-century manuscript, had been translated in 9th–10th-century Bulgaria by John the Exarch (Горский, Невоструев 1859: 311–318). Instead they concluded, and apparently quite correctly (cf. Ягич 1885–1895: 326–365), that this *other* translation was *younger* than the Exarch and probably executed by a Serb. This, then, has no bearing on *Doctrina* whatsoever. G. M. Prochorov's statement may have been influenced by a cautious suggestion which was based on a similar misunderstanding of Gorskij and Nevostruev, namely that the Sl. *Doctrina* was of an 'origine méridionale', probably ('sans doute') Serbian, and 'postérieure au XI<sup>e</sup> siècle' (I. Sorlin and V. Déroche in Dagron, Déroche 1991: 54–55; my emphasis – A.P.-M.). Neither of these versions, then, is based on any evidence from *Doctrina*. A more pertinent observation was published in 1910 by A. I. Sobolevskij, who had noted in the *Doctrina* the word *čistitelj* rendering Gk. ἱερέυς. This he regarded as a 10th-century East Bulgarian lexeme, possibly specifically Symeonian (Соболевский 1910: 122–123). However, he observed in another article that, if found in an ancient Bulgarian text, the word indeed indicated a Symeonian origin, but it had been adopted by Serbian and ESl. bookmen in the 11th–13th centuries

(Соболевский 1910: 94, cf. fn 123; cf. on the word Пичхадзе 2011: 58–59), which opened up for much later use as well. The observation, then, was interesting but insufficient, even if it had at all been possible to date a translation exclusively on account of one word in late manuscripts. Having carried out, in 2002, a provisional examination of quotations from Psalms in the edited 16th-century manuscript of the *Doctrina*, which revealed only third-redaction readings, suggestive of a text no older than very late 13th century and more probably of the early 14th century, I concluded that (Pereswetoff-Morath 2002 1: 175): “Pending an in-depth study of its language and biblical quotations, we should thus presume the *Doctrina* to be a 14th c., probably mid-14th c., South Slavonic, possibly Serbian, translation (notwithstanding that its morphology is rather ‘good’ and conservative).”

That position is now untenable, but an ‘in-depth study’ of ‘biblical quotations’ in *Doctrina* turns out to be a task of considerably greater importance than the discrete task of dating its the translation. For certain, it will provide a means to reach an earlier *terminus ante* for the translation, but this *terminus* now promises to be so early as to help us in the task of locating the translation. It may also help to clarify points in the history or prehistory of several of the most ancient Kyivan literary texts and, possibly, point us to one possible external impulse for the pre-occupation with anti-Judaic themes in early Orthodox culture in Slavonic. It may also aid future research into the versions of the Old Testament available to the South and East Slavs in the first centuries of Sl. letters.

## THE OLD IN THE NEW: QUOTATIONS

### *Mustering the evidence*

In tracing the history of the text we are in a comparatively favourable position even before completing a critical study of its textual history, notwithstanding the relatively late manuscript evidence. In the pseudo-Ezran text briefly discussed above we have seen that ostensibly Old Testament quotations could be preserved with only relatively minor interference in the manuscript tradition of both *Doctrina* and *Speech*, no matter that quotations from the very well known Psalms were, at least partly, updated in younger manuscripts and notwithstanding that the overall linguistic form of the text may have been rejuvenated at some stage in its history. This is because we also possess a critical edition of the Gk. *Doctrina*, which text, mainly apart from its introduction (see Déroche in Dagron, Déroche 1991: 56–57, 70–75), turns out to be textually very close to the extant Sl. translation. As a result, we can conclude that readings common to 1) the earliest extant mss of the Sl. *Doctrina*, the donor, and 2) mss of a ‘receiving’ Sl. text such as *Speech*, which are also supported by 3) the Gk. original of the *Doctrina* as extant in the manuscript tradition, are very likely to belong to the original translation.

Quotations which had been ‘doctored’ at stages preceding the composition of our texts, and this in such a way that even structurally – e.g. through contractions, transpositions, or additions – they differed from canonical biblical text, offer a particular methodological advantage while pointing us, surprisingly, to

some of the most reverentially preserved parts of the Sl. *Doctrina*. When the supposed source text could not easily be found in the Orthodox libraries of the time, the medieval copyist was hard put to check and correct the quotations, yet, as it seems, would not remove them because of their ostensibly sacred character. Here the risk that similarities between texts might be due to mere coincidence is minimised, particularly when we can retrace their specifics to the Greek of a specific source text. (They may also signal longer passages where genealogical links has not been obscured, but this must be verified in future studies.) As a consequence, structurally modified scriptural quotations provide valuable information on the history both of the borrowing text and of the donor text; they become, in Vilkul's term, our control texts and have been specially sought out in our analysis. We may ignore at this stage that some such quotations undoubtedly *will* have been changed over the centuries in one text form or other (compare, for example, quotation no. 5 below, whose original form was kept in only one consulted manuscript of the *Doctrina*). These we shall possibly not catch in our net, but nor will they have much negative effect on our results as long as we do not rely too heavily on evidence *e silentio*.

It should be noted that very many of the undoctored Old Testament texts are likely to have been adapted to the canonical Sl. version(s) even by the translator of *Doctrina* (or this is what the consulted manuscripts suggest). In each separate case, however, this is very difficult to prove.

1. As Tvorogov noted (Творогов 2005: 131–132), the *Speech's* version of Is 9:2 (9:1 in the Hebrew bible and occasionally so numbered in editions of LXX as well) has 'significant differences' from the received Sl. versions. These consist of both a contraction, corresponding to 'in darkness, see a great light! O you who live' in LXX, and single differing lexemes and constructions<sup>34</sup>:

*Speech*:

Исаија же рече: „Съходящии въ страну и сѣнь сѣмьртъную, свѣтъ вѣсияеть на вы“ (*Ostr. 101, 19–20*).

Jesaja aber hat gesagt: Der hinabsteigt<sup>35</sup> in das Land und den Schatten des Todes, ein Licht wird auf euch aufstrahlen (*Mül. 125*).

*Variant readings*: съходящии HANcNaNt:  
съходяще L: сходящеи RA; сѣнь LAHXNc:  
сѣни RNANt.

*Is 9:2 (NETS [LXX])*:

O you people who walk in darkness, see a great light! O you who live in the country and in the shadow of death, light will shine on you!

*Is 9:2 (LXX)*:

ὁ λαὸς ὁ πορευόμενος ἐν σκότει, ἴδετε φῶς μέγα· οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν χώρᾳ καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου, φῶς λάμψει ἐφ' ὑμᾶς.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Müller (2001: fn 125): 'Das Bibelzitat ist aber dem hebr. und dem griech. Text gegenüber verkürzt und stark enstellt'.

<sup>35</sup> Here, Müller (2001: fn 125) choses to understand the participle of some mss as a n.m.sg. (cf. LXX) – although with the formant *-ašč-* – but the plural evinced at least by *LRA* should be preferred in light of the evidence from *Doctrina*.

Is 9:2 (Proph.):

ЛЮДИЕ ХОДАЩИ ВЪ ТЪМѢ ВІДѢШѢ СВѢТЪ  
ВЕЛИКЪ ÷ ЖИВѢЩИ ВЪ СТРАНѢ СЪМРЪТНѢИ  
СВІАТЪ ВЪСНѢТЪ (Grig. 123).

The main ms omits the и сѣни usually present after  
въ странѣ; the main ms adds на вы above the last  
word (the addition probably present in the other mss).

Is 9:2 (Catena):

ЛЮДІЕ ХОДАЩЕИ ВЪ ТМѢ . ВИДѢШ<sup>Т</sup> СѢ<sup>Т</sup> ВЕЛИКЪ  
÷ ЖИВОУЩИИ ВЪ СТРАНѢ И В СѢНИ СМРТНѢИ .  
СВѢТЪ ПРОСВѢТИТИСА НА ВЫ : — (TSL89 69r).

RNB. K-B 9/34 (1 half of the 14th century), as  
quoted by Tvorogov (Творогов 2005: 131), has  
просвѣтиса for просвѣтитиса.

The contractions as against to the scriptural text coincide exactly in *Speech*  
and the Gk. and Sl. *Doctrina*:

*Doctrina Iacobi*:

И ПАКЫ ІСАІА ГЛѢТЬ, СЪХОДАЩЕИ ВЪ СТРАНѢ  
И СѢНЬ СЪМРЪТНЮ. СВѢТЪ ВОСІАЕТЪ НА ВЫ.  
(RGIA3760 24v).

*Variant readings*: RGADA93 adds и after пакы;  
съходѣщен RGADA93, Vol.5/8: съходѣше TSL91;  
странѣ TSL91, Vol.5/8: странѣ RGADA93.

Καὶ πάλιν Ἡσαΐας λέγει· «Οἱ  
καταβαίνοντες ἐν χώρᾳ καὶ ἐν σκιᾷ  
θανάτου, φῶς λάμψει ἐφ' ὑμᾶς» (Dér.  
I, 25)<sup>36</sup>.

The second ἐν omitted in one ms.

This telling correspondence on a structural level is confirmed by the specific Sl. wording (*schoditi* against *choditi*<sup>37</sup>, which reflects a difference in the Gk. originals) and the concomitant accusative construction for motion *vъ stranu i sěnb*<sup>38</sup> as against the locative of the received texts. (There is less certainty in what concerns the distribution of forms of the present participle, where, however, the consulted mss of the Sl. *Doctrina* support the reading of *L*.) Contextually, the introduction ‘and (again) Isaiah says/said’, is similar in the texts and may have been introduced in *Speech* or in a previous compilation together with the quotation proper. All in all, the common text form and the common vocabulary strongly suggest that *Speech* here closely reproduces *Doctrina*. The quotation is Tvorogov’s no. 14.

2. In the quotation in *Speech* from Is 56:7, a passage lacking in the Sl. prophetology (cf. Thomson 1998: 846; Grig., *index locorum*), we find different vocabulary from that of the catenical translation:

<sup>36</sup> ‘Vous qui descendez dans le pays et l’ombre de la mort, la lumière brillera sur vous.’

<sup>37</sup> Here, and in what follows, I shall render the 11th – early 12th-century ESL texts, all belonging to the sphere of ChSl., as though retaining ultrashort vowels but no nasals. Since the ms evidence is late, forms may at times seem to be neither 11th nor, say, 15th century, but this is difficult to avoid. Single words and short locutions are given in a slightly idealised 11th-century form rather than in exact transliteration. All digraphs and ligatures of ‘o’ and ‘u’ are transliterated as a simple ‘u’; all kinds of ‘e’, including ‘je’, are transliterated as ‘e’, and no attempt is made to ‘reconstruct’ instances of orthographically non-signalled intervocalic [j]; ‘u’ is transliterated as ‘šč’.

<sup>38</sup> Not contradicted by the Greek (see Danker 2000: 327, 514; cf., for example, Jn 5:4).

*Speech:*

„ДОМЪ МОИ ДОМЪ МОЛИТВѢ ПРОЗОВЕТЬ СЯ  
ВЪСѢМЪ ЯЗЫКОМЪ“ (*Ostr.* 99, 23–4).

Mein Haus wird ein Haus des Gebetes für  
alle Völker genannt werden (*Mül.* 121).

*Variant readings:* *R* (and possibly *A*) add *мо̅ѣ* after  
the first *домъ*; *прозоветь LHNc:* наречеть *RAX*;  
*всѣмъ LRAHNc:* по всѣмъ *X*.

*Is 56:7 (NETS [LXX]):*

for my house shall be called a house of  
prayer for all the nations

*Is 56:7 (LXX):*

ὁ γὰρ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς  
κληθήσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν

*Is 56:7 (Proph.):*

*Lacking.*

*Is 56:7 (Catena):*

ДОМЪ БО МОИ . ДОМЪ МЛТВЫ НАРЕЧЕТСА .  
ВЪСѢМЪ ЄТРАНАМЪ (*TSL89 106r*).

Here, even though the Greek of *LXX* and *Doctrina* is for all practical purposes identical, the Sl. translation is revealing:

*Doctrina Iacobi:*

И ПАКЫ. ДѢМЪ БО МОИ ДѢМЪ МЛТВЫ  
ПРОЗОВЕ|ТСА ВЪСѢМЪ ЯЗЫКОМЪ (*RGIA3670*  
*53r–v*).

Καὶ πάλιν· «Ὁ γὰρ οἶκός μου οἶκος  
προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πᾶσι τοῖς  
ἔθνεσιν» (*Dér.* II, 8)<sup>39</sup>.

*Variant readings:* *TSL91, RGADA93, Vol.5/8* add *и*  
after *мои*; *прозветса TSL91, RGADA93:* призоветса  
*Vol.5/8;* *всѣмъ яззыкѡмъ TSL91:* всѣми яззыкы  
*RGADA93, Vol.5/8.*

The reconstructed verb of *Speech* (supported by *NPLml* and *H*), *prozъvati sja*, coincide with that of the Sl. *Doctrina* against the catenical *nareči sja*; so does, notably, the rendering of Gk. ἔθνος as *jazykъ* as against the catenical *strana*. To all appearances, then, the collection used by the compiler of this part of *Speech* contained the text still witnessed by the extant mss of *Doctrina* (notwithstanding that Evsčev (Евсеев 1897: 163) thought it was of a catenical type). With the risk of begging the question, we may note that *Speech* may possibly retain an older *molitvĕ*, replaced by *molitvy* in the consulted mss of *Doctrina*. The quotation is Tvorogov’s no. 6.

3. Moving on to chapter 38 (*LXX*) in the book of Jeremiah (chapter 31 in the Hebrew bible), we find, in *Speech*, a contraction reminiscent of that in example 1, quite apart from the fact that verse 32 and half of verse 33 is missing (these verses are present in all other quoted texts but replaced by an ellipsis below):

<sup>39</sup> ‘Car ma maison sera appelée maison de prière pour toutes les nations.’

*Speech:*

Иеремиа же рече: „Тако глаголетъ Господь: Положу дому Иудову завѣтъ новъ. Дая законы въ разумѣния ихъ, и на сръдъца ихъ напишю, и буду имъ Богъ, и ти будутъ мнѣ въ люди“ (*Ostr.* 99, 15–18).

*Variant readings:* *Nc* omits же; *HX* add и after господь; иудову *RAH:* июдину *LXNc;* *Nc* adds мои after завѣтъ; разумѣния *RAHXNc:* неразумья *L;* сръдъца *LAHXNc:* срѣе *R;* *L* omits и after напишю; *HX* add въ after имъ; ти *LAH:* тии *RX:* тѣ *Nc;* люди *LRAX (and H?):* людие *Nc.*

*Jer 38 (31):31, 33 (NETS [LXX]):*

Behold, days are coming, quoth the Lord, and I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Iouda. [...] Giving I will give my laws in their mind, and I will write them on their hearts, and I will become a god to them, and they shall become a people to me.

*Jer 38 (31):31, 33 (Proph.):*

Тако глѣтъ ꙗ̄зъ ѳ̄ се дение градѣтъ ѳ̄ и завѣщаа домѣ ꙗ̄звѣдъ ѳ̄ и домоу иудовоу ѳ̄ завѣтъ новъ ѳ̄ [...] даа законы моа ѳ̄ в помышлен-ї-хъ ѳ̄ и на срѣци ихъ напишѣ а ѳ̄ и бѣдѣ имъ въ ѳ̄ и ти бѣдѣтъ мнѣ въ люди ѳ̄ (*Grig.* 361).

*Variant readings:* в помышлен-ї-хъ : alternative readings: помышление ихъ, въ помышления ихъ; other mss add въ after имъ.

Here too, quite apart from the fact that verse 32 and half of verse 33 is missing in *Speech* (even though they are extant in *Doctrina*), we have a very noticeable contraction common to *Speech* and both the Gk. and Sl. *Doctrina* in that the house of Israel is removed mid-sentence. Cf. in *Doctrina*:

Jeremia aber sagte: So spricht der Herr: Und ich werde einen neuen Bund machen dem Hause Juda, indem ich meine Gesetze in ihren Sinn gebe, und in ihre Herzen werde ich sie schreiben, und ich werde ihnen ihr Gott sein, und sie werden mir mein Volk sein (*Mül.* 120–121).

*Jer 38 (31):31, 33 (LXX):*

Ἴδου ἡμέραι ἔρχονται, φησὶν κύριος, καὶ διαθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραηλ καὶ τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰουδα διαθήκην καινὴν [...] Διδούς δώσω νόμους μου εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν γράψω αὐτούς· καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς θεόν, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μοι εἰς λαόν·

φησὶν: alternative reading λέγει; καρδίας: alternative reading καρδίαν

*Jer 38 (31):31, 33 (Catena)<sup>40</sup>:*

W новѣмъ завѣтѣ хвѣ глѣтъ . Се днѣ градѣтъ глѣтъ ꙗ̄ . и завѣщаю домоу иудовоу и завѣтъ новъ [...] даа законы моа въ оумѣ ꙗ̄ . и на срѣцихъ ꙗ̄ напишѣ а . и бѣдоу имъ въ въ, и ти бѣдоутъ ми в люди (*TSL* 89 214v).

<sup>40</sup> The passage in the catena, or in the cited ms of the catena, appears to have converged with that of the prophetologion if it was not originally taken over from it. This has not been further analysed here.

### *Doctrina Iacobi:*

рече во иеремїа, се днїе града, ꙗкъ глеть грь.  
и положюу до мѣк іюда, инѣ завѣтъ новъ [...]  
даю законы моа въ разумѣніе ѿ, и на срце ѿ  
напишѣ ѿ, и въ да, ꙗкъ имъ въ бгъ, и тї въ да, оу  
ми въ лѣ (RGIA3760 7v).

Φησὶ γὰρ Ἰερεμίας: «Ἴδου ἡμέραι  
ἔρχονται, λέγει Κύριος, καὶ διαθήσομαι  
τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰούδα διαθήκην καινὴν  
[...] διδοὺς νόμους μου εἰς διάνοιαν  
αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν αὐτῶν γράψω  
αὐτούς, καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς Θεόν, καὶ  
αὐτοὶ ἔσονταί μοι εἰς λαόν.» (*Dér. I, 10*)<sup>41</sup>.

*Variant readings:* RGADA93 omits и after грь;  
положюу TSL91, Vol. 5/8: положи RGADA93; іюда, инѣ  
TSL91, Vol. 5/8: іюда, ѿнѣ RGADA93; даю : даю  
TSL91, RGADA93, Vol. 5/8; разумѣніе TSL91:  
разумѣніа RGADA93, Vol.5/8; RGADA93 omits и  
after ѿ; срце TSL91, RGADA93: срцеꙗъ Vol. 5/8;  
RGADA93 omits въ after имъ; тї TSL91, Vol.5/8:  
тѣ RGADA93; ми TSL91, Vol.5/8: мнѣ RGADA93;  
RGADA93 omits въ after мнѣ

Apart from this structural trait, the idiosyncratic<sup>42</sup> translation of εἰς διάνοιαν αὐτῶν ('in their mind') as *въ разумѣніе/-ја ихѣ* ('in their understanding(s)'), common to *Speech* and the *Doctrina* (although with fluctuating grammatical number), sets them off against the biblical *въ помышленіе/-ја ихѣ* or *въ уму ихѣ*. Both lexical traits and text form is, then, very suggestive of the Sl. *Doctrina* as the ultimate Sl. source text of *Speech*<sup>43</sup>. If Trendafilov (Трендафилов 1999: 176–177) intended to show that this quotation in *Speech* is textually related to that in the *Life of Constantine*, he was mistaken. (Demonstrating this convincingly, Reinhart erroneously claims that the biblical passage is not in the Sl. prophetology, see Reinhart 2008: 155.) *Doctrina* supports *LHNc Ijudinu* as against *Ijudovu* in *Tale*.

4. However, the clearest piece of evidence from Jeremiah is a conspicuously doctored quotation from chapter 17, a part of the book that was never translated into OCS, if not in the rare and now lost 'complete translation' (cf. Thomson 1998: 846, 857, compare also 853–854). Here, as a result, compilers and copyists had no or little possibility of comparing their text with authoritative sources. Short as it is, the glaring near-*agraphon* is highly indicative of an origin in the Sl. *Doctrina*:

<sup>41</sup> Jérémie dit en effet: „Voici que viennent des jours, dit le Seigneur, où j'établirai avec la maison de Juda une alliance nouvelle [...] en donnant mes lois, je les graverai dans leur pensée et dans leur cœur, et je serai leur Dieu et ils seront mon peuple“.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. also Müller's comments on the unexpected semantics of the wording (Müller 2001: 120). Among OCS and OESl. translated examples provided with Gk. originals, neither the Prague *Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae* nor the *Словарь древнерусского языка* records any correspondences *διάνοια* : *razuměnie*.

<sup>43</sup> All Sl. texts – along with the Gk. *Doctrina* – have simplified the Hebraism *Διδοὺς δώσω* ('giving I will give'). This, then, has no bearing on our analysis. The same is true, at this stage of knowledge of the history of the texts, for the grammatical number of the word for 'heart', which vacillates in all text traditions, including the LXX.

*Speech:*

И пакы: „Чловѣкъ естъ; и кѣто увѣстъ, яко Богъ естъ, яко чловѣкъ умираеть“ (Ostr. 100, 24–25).

*Variant readings:* RA add же after пакы; LNeNt omit и; NeNt add и after the second естъ; HX add же after the second чловѣкъ.

*Jer 17:9 (NETS [LXX]):*

[The heart is deep above all else, and] so<sup>44</sup> is man, and who shall understand him?

*Jer 17:9 (Proph.):*

*Lacking.*

Und wiederum: Er ist Mensch. Und wer wird [ihn] erkennen? Als Gott ist er, als Mensch aber stirbt er (Mül. 123).

*Jer 17:9 (LXX):*

[βαθεῖα ἡ καρδία παρὰ πάντα, καὶ] ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν· καὶ τίς γινώσεται αὐτόν;

*Jer 17:9 (Catena):*

*Lacking.*

In *Doctrina* this reads:

*Doctrina Iacobi:*

ѣкоже глѣтъ іереміа. и члѣкъ іе, и ктѣ ѡвѣстъ и іако бѣ іе. и іако чловѣкъ же ѡмреть. ѣкоже прѣвзвѣстиша стѣи пррци и закѣ стѣи. ѣкоже бѣ чюдѣ створи (RGIA3760 13v).

*Variant readings:* TSL91, Vol. 5/8 omit и after ѡвѣстъ; Vol. 5/8 adds и after the first іако; ѡмреть : оумре TSL91, RGADA93, Vol. 5/8; ѣкоже RGADA93, Vol. 5/8; іако іаже TSL91.

καθὼς λέγει Ἰερემίας: «Καὶ ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν καὶ τίς γινώσεται αὐτόν;», τουτέστιν ὅτι καὶ Θεός ἐστιν. Καὶ ὡς ἄνθρωπος μὲν ἀπέθανεν, καθὼς προεμήνυσαν οἱ ἅγιοι προφηταὶ καὶ ὁ ἅγιος νόμος, ὡς δὲ Θεὸς ἐθαυματουργήσεν (Dér. I, 15)<sup>45</sup>.

τουτέστιν omitted in one ms.

As Müller points out, the words after *uvěstb* are not part of even the Orthodox bible and still less of the Hebrew, but the medieval reader had no way of knowing this. In LXX, Jer 17:9 differs sharply from bibles that translate from the Masoretic Hebrew (in the New Revised Standard Version: ‘The heart is devious above all else; it is perverse – who can understand it?’), since it goes back to reading  $\psi\iota\mu\grave{\nu}$  (‘man’) where the Masoretic has  $\psi\grave{\iota}\mu\grave{\nu}$  (‘corrupt’) (Lust et al. 2003: 50; cf. Mü-

<sup>44</sup> Translator’s note: ‘Lacking in Gk’.

<sup>45</sup> ‘Comme le dit Jérémie „Et il est homme et qui le connaîtra?“, c’est-à-dire qu’il est aussi Dieu. Et en tant qu’homme il est mort, comme l’avaient annoncé les saints prophètes et la sainte Loi, en tant que Dieu il a fait des miracles.’

ller 2001: 123). As a result, the passage was read in patristic literature as an affirmation of the humanity of Christ and of the ‘impossibility of fully understanding him in his divinity’ (Law 2013: 138). The equally grave misunderstanding added to this in the text evidenced by *Speech*<sup>46</sup> probably originally arose from a lacking *τουτέστιν* (‘that is’) in the translator’s Gk. antigraph, after which the indiscriminate use of *jako* for rendering two different Gk. words has allowed the compiler of the prophetic collection to attach the subordinate clauses incorrectly and to achieve, by also changing the grammatical tense (contrast the correspondence between the Gk. and the majority of consulted mss of the Sl. *Doctrina*), a Jeremian prophecy not only of the two natures of Christ, but also of his death as a man, where the Hebrew bible spoke only of the devious human heart. But for the aspect (not to put too fine a point on the term) and tense of the verb ‘to die’, the form of the passage coincides in *Speech* and *Doctrina*.

5. This is immediately followed in *Speech* by Zech 7:13, which was only available in the catenical translation. It is in a form which differs markedly from LXX, albeit less radically than Jer 17:9:

*Speech*:

Захарья же рече „Не послушаша сына моего, и не услышу ихъ, глаголетъ Господь“ (*Ostr.* 100:26–27).

Sacharja aber sagte: Sie haben nicht auf meinen Sohn gehört, und ich werde sie nicht erhören, spricht der Herr (*Mül.* 123).

*Variant readings*: *NcNt* omit же; *NcNt* omit the first не; послушаша *LRHX*: послѣшаше *A*: слушающая *Nc*: послушаи *Nt*; *RA* omit и.

*Zech 7:13 (NETS [LXX])*:

And it will be, just as he said, and they did not listen [to him – *A.P.-M.*]; so they will cry out, and I will not listen, says the Lord Almighty.

*Zech 7:13 (LXX)*:

καὶ ἔσται ὃν τρόπον εἶπεν καὶ οὐκ εἰσήκουσαν αὐτοῦ, οὕτως κεκράζονται καὶ οὐ μὴ εἰσακούσω, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ.

αὐτοῦ missing in some mss; αὐτῶν added after *εἰσακούσω* in some mss.

*Zech 7:13 (Catena)*:

и не оуслышаша еи<sup>д</sup>, възгнѣють, и не имамъ оуслышати . глеть гъ вседръжителъ (*TSL89* 44v).

<sup>46</sup> Not immediately visible in Müller’s translation, since the German scholar, aware of the extent of the actual scriptural quotation, attempts to save it intact and then interpret the rest of the Slavonic independently.

### *Doctrina Iacobi:*

ω не върѣдѣюцѣи бо х̄оӯ захарїа глеть [...] не  
послѣшаша сна моего . и не оуслышю ѥ глеть  
гь̄ вседѣрѣжительство (TSL91 76a–77a)<sup>47</sup>.

Περὶ γὰρ τῶν μὴ πιστευόντων τῷ  
Χριστῷ Ζαχαρίας λέγει· [...] «Ὅκ  
εἰσήκουσαν Ἡ» τοῦ Υἱοῦ μου, καὶ «ὦ  
Ὁ μὴ εἰσακούσω αὐτῶν, λέγει Κύριος  
παντοκράτωρ» (Dér. III, 9)<sup>48</sup>.

Apart from the exact verbal correspondence between *Speech* and *Doctrina*, we note, in contradistinction to the biblical text, that they elide ‘so they will cry out’, add an object to the verb ‘I will not listen’, and, in particular, substitute ‘my son’ for ‘him/it’ whom the Jews did not heed (cf. Müller 2001: fn 123). This is done in a way which is absolutely alien to genuine scripture but which allows the compiler to make one more theological point, similarly to what happened in the preceding Jeremian quotation.

### TECHNICAL COMMENTARY

In the analysis of quotations from the minor and major prophets in two works of Kyivan literature which exhibit marked similarities with quotations in the Sl. *Doctrina*, the following text forms have been chosen: a) The *Philosopher’s Speech* (*Speech*) and other parts of the *Tale of Bygone Years* (*Tale*) are quoted from the reconstructed text (‘α’) of the interlinear edition of Ostrowski et al. in its updated internet version (Ostrowski et al.; quoted as ‘Ostr.’ + line number). This allows me to present rich textual evidence economically and not becoming the prisoner of single manuscripts. Meanwhile, I hope to avoid becoming the prisoner of Ostrowski’s *stemma codicum* by signalling such readings from the edition as might deserve consideration in the light of other adduced texts; these text witnesses are abbreviated as follows: *L* – *Laurentian*, *R* – *Radziwiłł*, *A* – *Academy*, *H* – *Hypatian*, *X* – *Chlebnikov*, *Nc* – *Novgorod Commission*, *Na* – *Novgorod Academy*, *Nt* – *Novgorod Tolstoj* (on these, see Ostrowski et al.: XX–XXI). b) As main text of the Sl. *Doctrina* I use the oldest known manuscript, viz. ms Russian State Historical Archive (St Petersburg), Син., оп. 3, no. 3760, from the beginning of the 15th century (quoted as RGIA3760), except for quotations nos 5, 7, 8, and part of 11 in our analysis (the last three in the second part of this paper), where a comparison with the Gk. *Doctrina* shows that its text is corrupt. Here I use as main text the ms Russian State Library (Moscow), f. 304.I (собр. Троице-Сергиевой лавры), no. 91, from the end of the 15th century (quoted as ‘TSL91’ + leaf number), as digitally available at <http://old.stsl.ru/manuscripts/index.php?col=1>. I add conflicting readings, other than purely orthographical ones (among which, in this ESL context, I include vacillations between *-tb* and *-t̄b* in 3rd person verbal endings, but also between ж and, for example, ѡ), from the one of these two mss not used as main text, but also from the ms Russian State Archive of Early Acts (Moscow), f. 231, no. 93, dated to the last third of the 15th century (quoted

<sup>47</sup> In RGIA3760, Vol.5/8, and RGADA93 this quotation has been adapted to the biblical text and the missing words restored from an unknown source: не послѣшаша юго. тако възвѣжть и не оуслышѣ ихъ, глеть гь̄ вседѣрѣжительство (RGIA3760, fo. 65r; *Variant readings*: послѣшаша TSL91, Vol.5/8: послѣшаша RGADA93; възвѣжть TSL91, Vol.5/8: возопиють RGADA93; TSL91 adds бо after глеть). However, the correspondence between the Gk. *Doctrina* and TSL91 proves unequivocally that this fuller version is secondary. We see from this example, where only one consulted manuscript has retained the original reading, that correspondences between *Doctrina* and borrowing texts can easily escape our attention. There may then have been borrowings in the chosen texts that we can no longer identify.

<sup>48</sup> ‘Zacharie dit en effet de ceux qui n’ont pas cru au Christ : [...] „Ils n’ont pas écouté“ mon Fils, et „Je ne les écouterai pas, dit le Seigneur tout-puissant“.’

as ‘*RGADA93*’), and from the early-16th-century part of the ms Russian State Library (Moscow), f. 113 (Собр. Иосифо-Волоколамского монастыря), no. 5/8 (quoted as ‘*Vol.5/8*’), as digitally available at <http://old.stsl.ru/manuscripts/113>). In the apparatus, each reading is signalled by the affected word or combination of words in the orthography of the main manuscript. This is immediately followed by the designation(s) of any additional ms(s) supporting this reading; the conflicting readings then follow, preceded in each case by a colon. What results is in no way intended as critical editions of these passages, but as presentations of parts of the paradoxos. c) The Gk. *Doctrina* is quoted from Vincent Déroche’s edition in Dagrón, Déroche 1991 (quoted as ‘*Dér.*’ + section numbers [‘I,1’ etc.]); readings from the critical apparatus have been signalled where deemed necessary in the light of other adduced texts. d) Hilarion’s sermon is quoted from Akent’ev’s diplomatic edition from 2005 whereby supralinear signs other than letters and *titla* are excluded (quoted as ‘*Ak.*’ + page of the edn); the editions of Müller and Moldovan are occasionally quoted supplementarily. e) The liturgical text of the prophets are given from the edition of the Grigorovič prophetologion as edited in Ribarova, Hauptova 1998 (quoted as ‘*Grig.*’ + page of the edn); readings are adduced from its critical apparatus when thought necessary in the light of the other texts. f) The Sl. catenae are quoted from the edition of the minor prophets in Златанова 1998 (quoted as ‘*Zlat.*’ + page), or, in other cases, the ESL. ms Russian State Library (Moscow), f. 304.I (собр. Троице-Сергиевой лавры), no. 89 from the beginning of the 16th century (quoted as ‘*TSL89*’ + leaf number), as digitally available at <http://old.stsl.ru/manuscripts/index.php?col=1>. g) The Gk. LXX is quoted from Rahlfs, Hanhart 2006 (quoted in the tables as ‘*LXX*’ + book, chapter, and verse; verses are numbered as in the *New English Translation of the Septuagint* (see below); however, where there is a divergence, the numbering commonly found in English bibles is also supplied). It should be noted that any observations in my text as to what is known or not known to the LXX tradition refers only, unless otherwise stated, to the evidence given in Rahlfs, Hanhart 2006. Manuscripts and editions of Sl. texts are quoted without any supralinear signs other than letters (always rendered without *pokrytie* or *titlo*), *titlo* without supralinear letters, *paerok*, dots over i, and *kendema* where it may stand in the place of и.

I supply the key texts with the best available scholarly translations. This has been made in order to assist the reader in interpreting these at times difficult passages, but also to hold me to their high standards and to aid the reader in spotting any mistakes of mine. This unavoidably results in the use of several modern languages. Thus, the translation of *Speech* is the German of Ludolf Müller (2001), which is also a critical edition in its own right (quoted as ‘*Mül.*’ + page)<sup>49</sup>. Hilarion’s sermon is quoted in Simon Franklin’s English translation (Franklin 1991; quoted as ‘*Fr.*’ + page); LXX in that of the team behind Pietersma, Wright 2009<sup>50</sup> (quoted as ‘*NETS (LXX)*’ + chapter and verse). The translation of the Gk. *Doctrina*, finally, are given in footnotes to the Gk. text in Vincent Déroche’s French rendition (always from the same opening in the edition as the Gk. original). Other parts of the Christian bible are cited from the Anglicised edition of the New Revised Standard Version. No separate translations are given of the Sl. received versions.

In addition to several prophetic quotations from the Sl. prophetologion and catenae, there is also, then, in *Speech* a layer of quotations taken over from a Sl. translation of the *Doctrina*; and this translation, as it turns out, is still present in the comparatively late extant manuscripts of the book (and we add to our nos

---

<sup>49</sup> Characterised by Gippius (2014: 342) as ‘without doubt the best available rendering [...] into a modern language’. The passages quoted are not affected by the many corrections introduced by Müller after accepting the *Načal’nyj svod* theory (Müller 2006).

<sup>50</sup> Available at <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/edition/> (last checked 12 November 2015). The electronic edition supersedes the printed one of 2009. The twelve [minor] prophets are translated by G. E. Howard; Isaiah (‘Esaias’) by M. Silva; Jeremiah (‘Jeremias’) by A. Pietersma, M. Saunders; Baruch (‘Barouch’) by T. S. L. Michael; and Ezekiel (‘Iezekiel’) by J. N. Hubler.

1–5 the pseudo-Ezran quotation and the accompanying quotation from Deut 28 in fn 29). Given the known affinity in form of several prophetic quotations in *Speech* and Hilarion's *Sermon on Law and Grace*, it seems reasonable to attempt to push the date of the translation even further back by investigating the prophetic quotations in that more ancient text. This will be one of the main tasks of the second part of this paper.

#### ABBREVIATIONS

ChSl. – Church Slavonic

ESl. – East Slavonic

Gk. – Greek

NPLml. – First Novgorod Chronicle, Younger Redaction

OCS – Old Church Slavonic

OESl. – Old East Slavonic

Sl. – Slavonic

SSL. – South Slavonic

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Dagron, Déroche 1991 D a g r o n, G., V. D é r o c h e. Juifs et chrétiens dans l'Orient du VIIe siècle. – *Travaux et Mémoires du Centre de recherche d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance*, 11, 1991, 17–243.
- Danker 2000 A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Edited and revised by F. W. Danker. 3rd edn. Chicago–London, 2000.
- Franklin 1982 F r a n k l i n, S. Some Apocryphal Sources of Kievan Russian Historiography. – *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, NS, 15, 1982, 1–27.
- Franklin 1991 F r a n k l i n, S. Sermons and Rhetoric of Kievan Rus'. – In: *Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature. English Translations. Vol. 5.* Cambridge, Mass., 1991.
- Gippius 2014 G i p p i u s, A. Reconstructing the Original of the *Povest' vremennyx let*: a Contribution to the Debate. – *Russian Linguistics*, 38, 2014, 341–366.
- Hryniewicz 1995 H r y n i e w i c z, W. Chrystus zmartwychwstał: Motywy paschalne w pismach metropolity Ilariona (XI w.). Warszawa, 1995.
- Law 2013 L a w, T. M. When God Spoke Greek. The Septuagint and the Making of the Christian Bible. New York, 2013.
- Lust et al. 2003 Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint. Compiled by J. Lust, E. Eynikel, K. Hauspie. Rev. edn. Stuttgart, 2003.
- Meillet 1897 M e i l l e t, A. Du genre animé en vieux-slave et de ses origines indo-européennes. Paris, 1897.
- Miller 2013 M i l l e r, J. The Prophetologion: The Old Testament of Byzantine Christianity? – In: *The Old Testament in Byzantium*. Ed. P. Magdalino, R. Nelson. Washington, D.C., 2013, 55–76.
- Müller 1962 M ü l l e r, L. Des Metropolitens Ilarion Lobrede auf Vladimir den Heiligen und Glaubensbekenntnis nach der Erstausgabe von 1844 neu herausgegeben, eingeleitet und erläutert (= Slavistische Studienbücher. Vol. 2). Wiesbaden, 1962.
- Müller 1971 M ü l l e r, L. Die Werke des Metropoliten Ilarion (= *Forum slavicum*. Vol. 37). München, 1971.

- Müller 1988–1989 Müller, L. Ilarion und die Nestorchronik. – *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 12–13, 1988–1989, 324–345.
- Müller 2001 Müller, L. Die Nestorchronik. Die altrussische Chronik, zugeschrieben dem Mönch des Kiever Höhlenklosters Nestor, in der Redaktion des Abtes Sil'vestr aus dem Jahre 1116, rekonstruiert nach den Handschriften Lavrent'evskaja, Radzivilovskaja, Akademičeskaja, Troickaja, Ipat'evskaja und Chlebnikovskaja und ins Deutsche übersetzt von Ludolf Müller (= *Handbuch zur Nestorchronik*. Ed. L. Müller. Vol. 4. *Forum Slavicum*. Vol. 56). München, 2001.
- Müller 2006 Müller, L. К критике текста, к тексту и переводу „Повести временных лет“. – *Russian Linguistics*, 30, 2006, № 3, 401–436.
- Ostrowski 2007 Ostrowski, D. The Načal'nyj Svod Theory and the Povest' vremennykh let. – *Russian Linguistics*, 31, 2007, № 3, 269–308.
- Ostrowski et al. Ostrowski, D., D. Birnbaum, H. G. Lunt. The Povest' vremennykh let: An Interlinear Collation and Paradosis. Undated corrected version at <http://hudce7.harvard.edu/>
- Pereswetoff-Morath 2002 Pereswetoff-Morath, A. A Grin without a Cat. Vols. 1–2 (= *Lund Slavonic Monographs*, 4–5). Lund, 2002.
- Pereswetoff-Morath 2006 Pereswetoff-Morath, A. “Whereby we know that it is the last time”: Musings on Anti-Messiahs and Antichrists in a Ruthenian Textual Community. Antidoron natalicium Laurentio Steensland expleto sexagesimo quinto aetatis anno oblatum. – In: *Slavica Lundenisia supplementa*. Vol. 3. Lund, 2006.
- Pereswetoff-Morath 2014 Pereswetoff-Morath, A. Christian Anti-Judaism and Jewish–Orthodox Relations among the Eastern Slavs up to 1569. – In: *Polin*. Vol. 26. *Studies in Polish Jewry*. Eds. Y. Petrovsky-Shtern, A. Polonsky (= *Jews and Ukrainians*). Oxford–Portland, OR, 2014, 101–129.
- Pietersma, Wright 2009 Pietersma, A., Wright, B. G. New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title. Eds. A. Pietersma, B. G. Wright. New York–Oxford, 2009.
- Podskalsky 1982 Podskalsky, G. Christentum und theologische Literatur in der Kiever Rus' (988–1237). München, 1982.
- Raba 2014 Raba, J. The Gift and Its Wages: The Land of Israel and the Jewish People in the Spiritual Life of Medieval Russia. – In: *Diaspora: New Perspectives on Jewish History and Culture*. T. 1. Transl. from Hebrew by anonymous. Turnhout, 2014.
- Rahlfs, Hanhart 2006 Rahlfs, A., Hanhart, R. Septuaginta. Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretis. With parallel Greek title. Eds. A. Rahlfs, R. Hanhart. Stuttgart, 2006.
- Reinhart 2008 Reinhart, J. Речь Философа Повести временных лет и ее великоморовская и преславская предыстория. – *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch*, 54, 2008, 151–170.
- Ribarova, Hauptova 1998 Ribarova, Z., Hauptova, Z. Paroimiaron Grigorovici, 1: Textus et apparatus criticus. With parallel Macedonian title. Skopje, 1998.
- Taube 2012 Taube, M. Jewish-Christian Collaboration in Medieval Slavic Translations from Hebrew. – Translation and Tradition in „Slavia Orthodoxa“. Ed. V. Izmirlijeva, B. Gasparov. – In: *Slavische Sprachgeschichte*. Vol. 5. Zürich, Münster, 2012, 26–45.

- Thomson 1983 Thomson, F. J. Quotations of Patristic and Byzantine Works by Early Russian Authors as an Indication of the Cultural Level of Kievan Russia. – *Slavica Gandensia*, 10, 1983, 65–102.
- Thomson 1998 Thomson, F. J. The Slavonic Translation of the Old Testament. – Interpretation of the Bible. Ed. J. Krašovec. Ljubljana–Sheffield, 1998, 605–920.
- Vajs 1915 Vajs, I. Zacharias-Malachias. *Analecta sacrae scripturae ex antiquioribus codicibus glagoliticis* (= *Prophetiae minores*. Vol. 5). Veglae, 1915.
- Акентьев 2005 Акентьев, К. К. „Слово о законе и благодати“ Илариона Киевского. Древнейшая версия по списку ГИМ Син. 591. – *Византинороссика*, 3, 2005, 116–152.
- Алексеев 1999 Алексеев, А. А. Текстология славянской Библии. With parallel German title (= *Bausteine zur slavischen Philologie end Kulturgeschichte*. Neue Folge. Reihe A: Slavistische Forschungen. Vol. 24). Köln–Weimar–Wien–St Petersburg, 1999.
- Ангелов, Кодов 1973 Климент Охридски. Събрани съчинения. Т. 3. Подг. за печат Б. Ст. Ангелов, Х. Кодов. София, 1973.
- Бегунов 1963 Бегунов, Ю. К. Болгарский писатель X в. Козма Презвитер в русской письменности конца XV – начала XVI в. – *ТОДРЛ*, 19, 1963, 289–302.
- Великие Минеи Четии 1907 Великие Минеи Четии, собранные Всероссийским митрополитом Макарием, декабрь, дни 18–23. Москва, 1907.
- Вилкул 2003 Вилкул, Т. Новгородская первая летопись и Начальный свод. – *Palaeoslavica*, 11, 2003, 5–35.
- Вилкул 2007а Вилкул, Т. Повесть временных лет и Хронограф. – *Palaeoslavica*, 15, 2007, № 2, 56–116.
- Вилкул 2007б Вилкул, Т. Толковая Палея и Повесть временных лет. Сюжет о „раздѣлении языкъ“. – *Ruthenica*, 6, 2007, 37–85.
- Вилкул 2011 Вилкул, Т. Текстология Повісті временних літ. Контрольні тексти: Книга Быття у Промові Філософа. – *Україна в Центрально-Східній Європі*, 11, 2011, 269–283.
- Вилкул 2012 Вилкул, Т. О происхождении „Речи Философа“. – *Palaeoslavica*, 20, 2012, № 1, 1–15.
- Водолазкин 2005 Водолазкин, Е. Г. Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палеяного повествования XI–XV веков). 2-ое изд. Санкт-Петербург, 2005.
- Гимон 2014 Гимон, Т. В. Паремийник. – В: *Древняя Русь в средневековом мире*. Энциклопедия. Ред. Е. А. Мельникова, В. Я. Петрухин. Москва, 2014, с. 590.
- Гиппиус 2001 Гиппиус, А. А. Рекоша дружина Игоревии...: К лингвотекстологической стратификации Начальной летописи. – *Russian Linguistics*, 25, 2001, 147–181.
- Гиппиус 2002 Гиппиус, А. А. О критике текста и новом переводе-реконструкции „Повести временных лет“. – *Russian Linguistics*, 26, 2002, 63–126.
- Гиппиус 2006 Гиппиус, А. А. Два начала Начальной летописи: К истории композиции Повести временных лет. – В: *Вереница литер*. К 60-летию В. М. Живова. Ред. А. М. Молдован. Москва, 2006, 57–96.

- Гиппиус 2008 Г и п п и у с, А. А. Крещение Руси в Повести временных лет: К стратификации текста. – Древняя Русь. Вопросы медиевистики, 2008, № 3, 20–23.
- Гиппиус 2009 Г и п п и у с, А. А. Рекоша дружина Игоревии... –3. Ответ О. Б. Страховой (Еще раз о лингвистической стратификации Начальной летописи). – *Palaeoslavica*, 17, 2009, № 2, 248–287.
- Гиппиус 2012 Г и п п и у с, А. А. До и после Начального свода: ранняя летописная история Руси как объект текстологической реконструкции. – В: Русь в IX–X веках: археологическая панорама. Ред. Н. А. Макаров. Москва–Вологда, 2012, 37–63.
- Горский 1844 [Г о р с к и й, А. В.] Памятники духовной литературы времен великого князя Ярослава I. – В: Прибавления к изданию творений святых отцов в русском переводе. Т. 2. Москва, 1844.
- Горский, Невоструев 1855 [Г о р с к и й, А., К. Н е в о с т р у е в]. Описание славянских рукописей Московской Синодальной библиотеки. Отд. 1. Священное писание. Москва, 1855.
- Горский, Невоструев 1859 [Г о р с к и й, А., К. Н е в о с т р у е в]. Описание славянских рукописей Московской Синодальной библиотеки. Отд. 2. Писания святых отцев. Ч. 2. Писания догматические и духовно-нравственные. Москва, 1859.
- Евсеев 1897 Е в с е е в, И. Книга пророка Исаяи в древнеславянском переводе. Ч. 1. Славянский перевод книги пророка Исаяи по рукописям XII–XVI вв. Санкт-Петербург, 1897.
- Жданов 1904 Ж д а н о в, И. Н. Слово о Законе и благодати и Похвала кагану Владимиру. – В: Ж д а н о в, И. Н. Сочинения. Т. 1. Санкт-Петербург, 1904, 1–80.
- Златанова 1998 З л а т а н о в а, Р. Книга на дванадесетте пророци с тълкования (= Старобългарският превод на Стария Завет. Т. 1. Под общата редакция и с въведение от Светлина Николова). София, 1998 (With English and German abstracts).
- Истрин 1906 И с т р и н, В. Из области древне-русской литературы. IV. Редакции Толковой Палеи. – Журнал Министерства народного просвещения. Н.с., 1906, № 2, отд. 2, 185–246.
- Карский 1926 Полное собрание русских летописей, издаваемое Постоянною историко-археологическою комиссиею Академии Наук СССР. Ред. Е. Ф. Карский. Т. 1. Лаврентьевская летопись. Вып. 1. Повесть временных лет. Изд. 2-ое. Ленинград, 1926.
- Крысько 2006 К р ы с ь к о, В. Б. Исторический синтаксис русского языка. Объект и переходность. 2-ое изд. Москва, 2006.
- Матвеев, Щёголева 2006 М а т в е е н к о, В., Л. Щ ё г о л е в а. Книги временные и образные Георгия Монаха. В двух томах. Т. 1. Москва, 2006, Ч. 1–2.
- Милтенов 2013 М и л т е н о в, Я. Златоструй: старобългарски хомилетичен свод, създаден по инициатива на българския цар Симеон. Текстологическо и извороведско изследване. София, 2013.
- Михеев 2011 М и х е е в, С. М. Кто писал „Повесть временных лет“? Москва, 2011.
- Молдован 1984 М о л д о в а н, А. М. „Слово о законе и благодати“ Илариона. Киев, 1984.

- Молдован 2002–2003 Молдован, А. М. Об „испорченных“ написаниях Синодального списка „Слова о законе и благодати“ Илариона. – *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics*, 44–45, 2002–2003, 441–451.
- Пересветов-Мурат 2007 Пересветов - Мурат, А. И. „Адонаи, заблудихомы!“: Об образе спорящего жидовина в восточнославянской письменности XIV–XV веков. – *Архив еврейской истории*. Т. 4. Москва, 2007, 51–83.
- Пересветов-Мурат 2008 Пересветов - Мурат, А. И. Аграф пророка Ездры – вновь идентифицированный источник Речи Философа. – *Древняя Русь. Вопросы медиевистики*, 2008, № 3, 48–50.
- Пичхадзе 2011 Пичхадзе, А. А. Переводческая деятельность в домонгольской Руси: лингвистический аспект. Москва, 2011.
- Прохоров 2003 Энциклопедия русского игумена XIV–XV вв.: Сборник преподобного Кирилла Белозерского, Российская Национальная библиотека, Кирилло-Белозерское собрание, № XII. Ред. Г. М. Прохоров. Санкт-Петербург, 2003.
- Савельев 2014 Савельев, В. С. „Повесть временных лет“. Источники и соотносимые тексты (Статья 1). – *Stephanos*, 3, Январь 2014, 73–156.
- Соболевский 1910 Соболевский, А. И. Материалы и исследования в области славянской филологии и археологии. Санкт-Петербург, 1910.
- Строев 1820 Софийский временник, или Русская летопись с 862 по 1534 год. Издал П. Строев. Т. 1. Москва, 1820.
- Строев 1828 Строев, П. О Византийском источнике Нестора. – *Труды и летописи Общества истории и древностей российских, учрежденного при Императорском Московском университете*, 4, 1828, № 1, 167–183.
- Сухомлинов 1908 Сухомлинов, М. И. О древней русской летописи как памятнике литературном. – В: *Исследования по древней русской литературе* (= Сборник ОРЯС, 85). Санкт-Петербург, 1908, 1–247.
- Тасева, Йовчева 2003 Книга на пророк Иезекиил с тълкования. Издание то е подготвено от Л. Тасева, М. Йовчева. Подбор на гръцкия текст Т. Илиева (= Старобългарският превод на Стария Завет. Под общата редакция и с въведение от Светлина Николова. Т. 2). София, 2003 (With English and German abstracts).
- Творогов 2005 Творогов, О. В. Об источнике библейских цитат в „Речи Философа“. – В: *От Древней Руси к новой России. Юбилейный сборник, посвященный члену-корреспонденту РАН Я. Н. Шапову*. Ред. А. Н. Сахаров. Москва, 2005, 128–133.
- Темчин 2007 Темчин, С. *Слово о законе и благодати* киевского митрополита Илариона и раннехристианская полемика. – *Ruthenica*, 7, 2007, 30–40.
- Темчин 2010 Темчин, С. Прение римского папы Сильвестра I с раввином Замбрием и кирилло-мефодиевская традиция. – В: Темчин, С. *Исследования по кирилло-мефодиевистике и палеославистике* (= *Krakowsko-Wileńskie studia slawistyczne*, 5). Kraków, 2010, 27–52.
- Трендафилов 1999 Трендафилов, Х. П. Хазарската полемика на Константин-Кирил. София, 1999.
- Турилов 2000 Каталог славяно-русских рукописных книг XV века, хранящихся в Российском государственном архиве древних актов. Ред. И. Л. Жучкова, Л. В. Мошкова, А. А. Турилов. Москва, 2000.

- Турилов 2009 Турилов, А. А. Иларион. – В: Русская православная энциклопедия. Т. 22 (Ик–Инн). Москва, 2009, 122–126.
- Турилов 2012 Турилов, А. А. Болгарские литературные памятники эпохи Первого царства в книжности Московской Руси XV–XVI вв. (заметки к оценке явления). – В: Турилов, А. А. Межславянские культурные связи эпохи средневековья и источниковедение истории и культуры славян. Этюды и характеристики. Москва, 2012, 199–219.
- Ужанков 2014 Ужанков, А. Н. „Слово о Законе и Благодати“ и другие творения митрополита Илариона Киевского. Москва, 2014.
- Шахматов 1904 Шахматов, А. А. Толковая Палея и Русская летопись. – Статьи по славяноведению, 1, 1904, 199–272.
- Шахматов 1940 Шахматов, А. А. „Повесть временных лет“ и ее источники. – ТОДРЛ, 4, 1940, 9–150.
- Шварцбанд 1989 Шварцбанд, С. К вопросу об источниках „Сказания о крещении Руси“. – In: Russian Literature and History: In Honour of Professor Pya Serman. Edited by W. Moskovich et al. Jerusalem, 1989, 132–145.
- Ягич 1885–1895 Ягич, И. В. Рассуждения южно-славянской и русской старины о церковно-славянском языке. – В: Ягич, И. В. Исследования по русскому языку. Т. 1. Санкт-Петербург, 1885–1895, 289–1067.

„СТАРОТО СЕ РАЗКРИВА В НОВОТО“: ЗА ПРОРОЧЕСКИТЕ ЦИТАТИ В СЛАВЯНСКИЯ ПРЕВОД НА „DOCTRINA IACOBI“ В НАЙ-СТАРАТА ЛИТЕРАТУРА НА КИЕВСКА РУСИЯ (Първа част)

*(Резюме)*

В първата част на настоящата статия се анализират няколко цитата от пророческите книги, намиращи се в „Речта на философа“, частично открити от Л. Мюлер и О. В. Творогов, които по форма и/или езикови особености очевидно се различават от известните от първите векове на славянската писменост канонични преводи на Свещеното писание. През 2006 г. авторът на тази статия доказва, че за основа на един от тези цитати – разказа на Ездра за разпятието, е послужил славянският превод на византийското антиюдейско съчинение „Doctrina Iacobi“ (Поученията на Яков), известен от староруски преписи от XV в. В настоящата статия се доказва, че същият произход имат в „Речта на философа“ цитатите от Ис. 9:2; Ис. 56:7; Иер. 17:9 (в много изменен вид в сравнение с библейския текст); Иер. 38 (31):31, 33; Зах. 7:13. Л. Мюлер излага хипотезата (Müller 1962; Müller 1971; Müller 1988–1989), че в литературата на Древна Русия е съществувала изгубена (?) днес тематична сбирка от старозаветни цитати за отхвърлянето на юдеите и призоваването на новия народ, което е намерило отражение както в „Речта на философа“, така и в „Словото за закона и благодатта“ на Иларион Киевски. В следващата и заключителна част на статията ще бъдат анализирани някои неканонични по форма цитати от пророците при Иларион с цел да се определи техният източник, да се оспори хипотезата на Мюлер за колекцията от пророчески цитати и по-точно да се фиксира времето на появата на „Doctrina Iacobi“ в източнославянската литература.

*Александър Пересветов-Мурат,  
Стокхолмски университет*