

ΣΠΑΡΑΓΜΑΤΑ
ΒΥΖΑΝΤΙΝΟΣΛΑΒΙΚΗΣ
ΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΙΑΣ

Χαριστήριο Τόμος στον Ομότιμο Καθηγητή
Ιωάννη Χρ. Ταρνανίδη

ΕΚΔΟΤΙΚΟΣ ΟΙΚΟΣ

Αδελφών Κυριακίδη α.ε.

Anisava Miltenova

**TOWARDS THE SLAVIC TRANSLATIONS OF *CAPITA
PARAENETICA* ASCRIBED TO EITHER NILUS OF
ANKYRA OR TO HESYCHIUS OF JERUSALEM**

It has been rightfully noticed many times that the medieval Bulgarian literature was prevailingly monastic in character. In other words, the greater part of both translated and original writings (no matter whether they belonged to the canonical monastic readings or not) were created in monasteries, were intended for monks and disseminated by monks. Any study of the First Bulgarian Kingdom's literary repertoire leads to the conclusion that it was "a typical monastic library similar to those in the bigger Byzantine monasteries"¹. This is based on an estimation of the medieval Bulgarian men of letters' mentality and interests: they, in the spirit of the Eastern Orthodoxy, translated and copied mainly texts related to both the catechistic part of Christian literature (i.e. the explanatory part which aims at preparing for Christianity and at practicing it) and the paraenetic part of the same literature (i.e. the didactic, instructive part)².

The monastic literature from the early period is preserved in fragments, so the conclusions concerning its scope and character are made, to a greater extent, on the basis of the manuscript col-

¹ Thomson 1999a: 117–118.

² Survey in: Thomson 1999a: 107–139; Veder 2005a; Veder 2005b; Miltenova 2007; Istorija 2008: 203–212.

lections of the Hilandar and Zograph monasteries on Mount Athos (as, by the way, is the case with the rest of the Slavic literary tradition)³.

The so-called *florilegia*⁴ take a major place in both Byzantine and Slavic monastic miscellanies, especially of those related to the Holy Mount of Athos. These anthologies include excerpts which favour the spiritual perfection of the Christian – from the Bible, from the writings of the Holy Fathers and ancient authors – as well as wise phrases (γνώμαι) and apophthegms (ἀποφθέγματα) combined with short exegetical texts with instructions and recommendations. In the *florilegia* the respective texts are organised, more or less consistently, according to a thematic or a structural principle⁵. The complexity of their textological study is due to the peculiarity of their content – they are comprised of numerous fragments which are difficult to identify. The long and complicated analysis of this paraenetic texts, the efforts to determine the history of the translations and their transmission sometimes have unexpected results in terms of their chronology and specifics. I have recently reported some information concerning a few anthologies of wise phrases, which are closely linked to the First Bulgarian Kingdom's monastic literature⁶.

In the present research I propose some data concerning an un-

³ Ταρνανιδις 1996: 337–346; Ταρνανιδις 2004, 175–195, 303–306. New details concerning the manuscript heritage can be found in the precious inventory of the newly discovered manuscript collection at St Catherin's Monastery on Mount Sinai, made by Prof. Ioannis Tarnanidis (Tarnanidis 1988); this discovery became the starting point for many new studies both in Byzantology and in Slavic studies.

⁴ Richard 1964 (Reprinted in *Opera minora*, t. 1, Turnhout, 1976, N 1, coll. 475–512).

⁵ Marti 1984: 126; Kuzidova 2003; Getov 2006: 1–2 and literature cited.

⁶ Miltenova, Getov 2001; Miltenova 2009.

1. In parchment Ms 382 (453) in the Hilandar's collection (further on Hil 382) – from the late 13th–early 14th century⁷, Serbian in origin; no jus signs, one-jer Rashka orthography – is preserved a fragment from the text on ff 59r(a)-60v(c) (two-column text). This copy is the oldest one in this group. Inc.:ѠСА ѠЗѠМѠВАН ТЛѠН'НА БЛГОЕ ЖЕ ДѠЛО НЕТАЛЮЩЕ. ЛѠНИ СЕ Ѡ ННѠ ЈЕЛНКО ЖЕ АКЫ СКОТЬ СТВАРАЮТЬ ЧЛѠКА. ДѠЛАН ЖЕ ТАА. End: Ѡ ГЛАВНЗНАХ ЖЕ СЛѠЕСНЫХЪ ДШЕ НЕ ЛѠНИ СЕ. ЧОЩЕШН БО СѠДНН НАМН МѠРАМН. П'МАЛѠ НСПЫТАНЪ БЫНТНН:✠

2. In parchment Ms 72 in the Romanian Academy of Sciences, Bucharest – Serbian in origin, 14th century⁸, ff 37r–43r: Прѡбнаго ѡца
нашего ннаа. ѡ разѡумни оуѡенна дѡѡепользнаа. Инс.: Страхъ нмѣн бжїї н
ѡтомъ къ всѣмъ свѣтельствуемъ свѣстн своиѣ бесѣдоуѡ самомоу бзїтн бѡу
вѣроуѡ вѣ ннхже дѣлаїѡшн прѡно бѣган похвалѡ стндн же се хоуѡзї.

⁷ V. M. Istrin, who discovered the miscellany, supposed it originated in the 13th century (Istrin 1896: 48). Sava Hilandarets accepted the same time of origin (1897: 20–21). P. A. Lavrov linked the manuscript to the late 13th–early 14th century (Lavrov 1899: I–XIV). He was the first to ascertain that it had content similar to the *Izbornik* of 1073. Identifying two folia from the V. Grigorovič collection (nowadays kept in the Russian State Library in Moscow, M 1702) as a part of the miscellany. The major part of the scholars date the manuscript around the border between the two centuries (see Matejic 1976: 32 – he classified the monument as a *Patericon* and dated it back to the 14th century; Bogdanovič 1978: 150–151, N 382 – he classified it as a *Zlatostruj*; Ivanova 1979: 57–59 as well as footnote 9 – she dated it back to the 13th–early 14th century; Matejic, Thomas 1992: 499 – defined the manuscript as *Zlatostruj*; Thomson 1993: 40, footnote 41, proposed as more valid dating the 14th century).

⁸ Panaitescu 1959: 87–88.

tions¹⁴.

The present study deals with a writing which is a selection of Christian ethical instructions (CPG 6583: *Sententiae*) grouped in two parts (very often merging or interwoven): a) *Capita paraenetica*. Inc.: Φόβον ἔχε θεοῦ καὶ πόθον (CPG 6583a, PG 79: 1252-1262); b). *Sententiae abducentes hominem a corruptibilibus*. Inc.: Ὁδὸς εἰς ἀρετὴν, ἡ τοῦ βίου φυγὴ (CPG 6583b, PG: 1240-1250). There are more than 40 Greek copies (the earliest are from the 9th century)¹⁵ of this text (henceforth *Capita paraenetica*)¹⁶ as well as some Armenian and Georgian translations. The copies, which vary according to the quantity and the ordering of the phrases both in Slavic and Byzantine manuscripts, appear not only with the name of Nilus of Ankyra (ca 390–430) but also with the name of Hesychius of Jerusalem (ca 380–433?).

The variation of the authorship directs us to the assumption that the text was originally by Evagrius Ponticus (ca 345–399). As soon as in the 6th–7th century a great number of Evagrius' writings (or parts of them) were ascribed to Nilus and Hesychius. It is a well-known fact that Evagrius, in the spirit of Neoplatonism, following the teaching of both Macarius of Egypt and Macarius of Alexandria, first systematised the ascetic writings of the Egyptian monks¹⁷. At the Second Council of Constantinople (553) Evagrius'

¹⁴ Miltenova 2000, 319–324. Miltenova, Getov 2002, 305–320 (and the literature quoted there); Miltenova 2008: 458–493; Miltenova 2009 (in print).

¹⁵ For a list of the manuscripts see Mennes 1971: 278–281, compare also the database at: http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/rech_oeuvre/resultOeuvre/filter_auteur/41-09/filter_oeuvre/5257

The popularity of the wise phrases is proven by the fact that Patriarch Photios mentions them at the end of a list of apophtegms and wise thoughts in his *Bibliotheca* at the spot where he speaks about γνώμαι in 22 chapters (codex 198).

¹⁶ This designation is introduced with the first publishing of the wise phrases (Fronton du Duc 1624).

¹⁷ Harmless 2004: 345–399.

texts were condemned as popularising Origen's ideology and this is why a great part of his writings began being spread by means of pseudo-authorship. *Capita paraenetica* fully corresponded to the mystical trend in the monks' perfection which was characteristic for this author¹⁸.

Copies of the two parts of the writing – or at least of certain fragments from it ascribed to Nilus of Ankyra – are included in about one half of the known and described manuscripts. No textological research has been done on them so far. Some extremely important details concerning the history of the text are presented in A. Guillaumont and C. Guillaumont's study on *Practicus (capita centum)* by Evagrius¹⁹. Under the title *Florilèges Évagriens* scholars group several Greek manuscripts, typical in composition, which include question-and-answer texts, excerpts from the writings of the Holy Fathers, apophthegms, short units of wise phrases etc.

The manuscripts most important for the present study among those are: 1) Gr 126, Russian State Library, Moscow, 12th century, ff 124r-v 120r-125v: Title: Νείλου γνῶμαι βιωφελείς. Inc.: Φόβον ἔχε θεοῦ καὶ πόθον (PG 79, 1252 B–1261 C and 1240 C–1244 C)²⁰; 2) Theol. Gr. 167, Austrian State Library, Vienna, 14th century, ff 179v–184v: Title: Τοῦ ὁσίου Νείλου γνῶμαι βιωφελείς. Inc.: Φόβον ἔχε θεοῦ... ((PG 79, 1252 B–1261 C and 1240 C–1249 B)²¹; 3). Vat. Ottobon. Gr. 436, Vatican Library, from the year 1435 ff 170v–172v: Title: Τοῦ ὁσίου Νείλου γνῶμαι βιωφελείς. Inc.: Φόβον ἔχε θεοῦ... (PG 79, 1225 B–1257 A-B); 4) Vallic. Gr. 67 (E 21) 14th century, ff 170v–172v: Title: Τοῦ αὐτοῦ κεφάλαια διάφορα ἐβδομήκοντα ε'. Inc.: Φόβον ἔχε θεοῦ... (PG 79, 1225 B–1257 B). A. Guillaumont and C.

¹⁸ Sinkewicz 2003: XVII–XL.

¹⁹ Guillaumont, Guillaumont 1971.

²⁰ Papoulidis 1981: 491; Guillaumont, Guillaumont 1971: 272–274.

²¹ Hunger, Kresten, Hannick 1984: 268–275; Guillaumont, Guillaumont 1971: 275–277.

Guillaumont found out that codices Gr 126, Theol. Gr. 167 and Patm. 548²² to a greater extent have a similar composition²³. They relate them to one and the same branch in the manuscript tradition with a hypothetical protograph ζ (early 12th century) originating from an archetype (υ) which, most probably, is much earlier²⁴. To this branch of *Capita paraenetica* and the surrounding *sententiae* we may well add also the codex Vatop. 38, 10th century, ff 154r–159v: Γνωμαὶ βιωφελεῖς. Inc.: Φόβον ἔχε θεοῦ... (PG 79, 1252 B 3 – 261 C 10 and 1240 C 1 – 1249 B 5; CPG 6583)²⁵. The listed copies ascribe the writing to Nilus of Ankyra (except for Vatop. 38, where it is anonymous).

It is worth mentioning here that there is an apparent similarity between these Greek miscellanies and the initial archetype of codex Hil. 382 (together with Ms 72 and Ms 310 in the Library of the Romanian Academy which are related to it). In the content of the Greek manuscripts prevail the theological question-and-answer writings and paraenetic excerpts from the Holy Fathers – John of Damascus, Maximus the Confessor, Nilus of Ankyra, Hesychius of Jerusalem etc. The first part of the Viennese manuscript Theol.gr. 167 from the year 1280 (ff 1–69) includes the Mirror (*Dioptra*) by Philip Monotropus; the largest part in the second half (from the late 13th century) is taken by the questions and answers of Athanasius of Sinai²⁶. Next to them finds its place a mosaic of paraenetic

²² Sakkelion 189: 235; this codex does not include the text examined here, but other excerpt with the name of Nilus.

²³ Guillaumont, Guillaumont 1971: 278–279; final stemma of witnesses in: Getov 2006: 3–4.

²⁴ Guillaumont, Guillaumont 1971: 369. According to the analysis of the whole content the composition was probably spread in the 10th century.

²⁵ I am very thankful to Dorotey Getov who directed me to this manuscript and gave me a photocopy of its description: Lamberz 2006: 168–183.

²⁶ Bibikov 1996: 150–151.

texts – *florilegia* type – translated in the above mentioned South Slavic manuscripts. It is logical to assume that the translation is made from a Greek manuscript similar in composition, most probably in a monastic environment.

In a second group of Greek manuscripts *Capita paraenetica* is ascribed to Hesychius of Jerusalem (under the name of the same author is included also in CPG 6583). Some of them are analysed and published by J.-K. Orellius²⁷; the text in his edition shows some differences in relation to the text published by Migne (PG 79 1252–1261 and 1240–1248). According to M. N. Speranskij the Slavic translation which is preserved in the Sviatoslav Miscellany (*Izbornik*) of 1076 (Russian in origin) goes back to a Greek archetype closer to the text published by Orellius²⁸. The publishers of the *Izbornik* of 1076 foster this opinion and so put as appendices namely the text printed in the mentioned edition²⁹.

Systematisation of Slavic translations has not finished yet. Nevertheless there are enough data on the basis of which one can outline (at least as an initial stage) the history of this popular paraenetic composition. Below I am going to summarise the known evidence.

The first (probably the earliest) Slavic translation of *Capita paraenetica* came to us in its earliest copy in the *Izbornik* of 1076 (Ermitažnoe 20 Russian State Library, St. Petersburg), Russian in origin, ff. 62б–79б (without any end): НАКАЗАНИЕ ꙗсѣхна презвѣтера неѣрсамѣ. Inc.: СѢДѢХЪ ВЪЗНѢЮУ НМѢН Н БЖІЮ ЛЮБѢВЬ. Н УНСТО КЪ ВЪСѢМЪ СРДЦЕ. The Greek archetype is, as I have already mentioned, a

²⁷ Orellius 1819: 320–349.

²⁸ Speranskij 1904: 433. According to him in *Melissa* (a Greek miscellany) was included another selection of the wise phrases ascribed to Hesychius.

²⁹ *Izbornik* 1965: 710–718.

combination of CPG 6583a and 6583b³⁰. The text was interpreted in detail at the reconstruction of the so-call *Kniazheski izborink* by W. Veder³¹. The transmission of the translation which appeared in Bulgaria in the 10th century could be traced in a number of Russian and Serbian manuscripts from the 14th to the 17th century – Veder divides them into three groups: 1) related to the so-called Menayon Miscellany (*Mineen izbornik*)³², 2) to the “veritable” Prince Miscellany (*Kniazheski izborink*) and 3) to the Miscellany of John the Sinner (*Izbornik na greshniya Ioan*). These groups present three successive stages of the reconstructed development of similar didactic compositions intended for instructing the Bulgarian heirs of the throne. Veder hypothesises that the Menayon Miscellany originated around the year 900 (for the princes Michail and Petăr), that the *Kniazheski izborink* was compiled at the same time (for Prince Petăr) and that the Miscellany of John the Sinner could be dated back after the year 960³³. The compilation of the miscellanies as a whole combines excerpts from already translated preaching and hagiographic writings³⁴ and in its turn becomes a basis for new compilations enriched with parts from the Egyptian *Paterikon*, Skete *Paterikon*, John the Climacus’ Ladder, John Chrysostom, the Bible Book called the The Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach and others. As a result from such “compilation of compila-

³⁰ See also Speranskij 1904: 420–421 who calls them Παράνεσις and Γνώμαι respectively.

³¹ Veder 2008: 8–10; 35–48.

³² Bulanin 1990: 161–178.

³³ Veder 2008: 12.

³⁴ *Vita* of St. Nyphon by Genadius of Constantinople (5th c. – 471), *Zlatostruj*, excerpts from the Simeon Miscellany (*Izbornik* of 1073), from the Skete *Paterikon*, *Vita* of Theodora of Alexandria, questions and answers by Pseudo-Athanasius of Alexandria, the *sententiae* by Menander, the Agapithus’ instructions for good ruling (one of the most popular Byzantine “Mirrors” dedicated to *ars gubernandi*) etc.

tions" down to us came the Sviatoslav Miscellany (*Izbornik*) of 1076 which was copied by a Russian man of letters (yet it is good evidence to the Old Bulgarian origin of the parts included in it)³⁵. The different lexical readings show the variety characteristic of this type of literature. The writing either remains anonymous or in its title there are various authors mentioned: Hesychius of Jerusalem (in Ermitažnoe 20 Russian State Library, *Izbornik* of 1076; in a miscellany of 16th c., Meleckij Monastery 119, Central Scientific Library, Kiev, and Ms 45, 15th–16th c., University Library, Saratov); St. Nyphont (Ms Pogodin 1032, 15th c., Russian State Library and Ms Voskresenskij 110, 16th–17th c., State Museum of History, Moscow); St. Ephrem (manuscript T.p. 13, 14th c., Library of Russian Academy, St. Petersburg and Ms 26, 14th c., National Library of Serbia, Belgrade), and a fragment in Ms 1037, 14th c., National Library of Bulgaria, Sofia, bears the name Nilus³⁶. No matter the differences between the witnesses (mainly in terms of the number of the *sententiae*), the reconstructed text of *Capita paraenetica* in this Medieval Bulgarian translation is reliable when comparing it with the rest of the translations of the text.

In his research on the sentential literature M. N. Speranskij views as part of the earliest translation a fragmental copy which is found in a parchment manuscript Ms 93 (1–2) (M. 2513 I–II) from A. N. Popov's collection, Russian National Library, Moscow, 14th–15th century, uncial in two columns. The text is on ff 67b–68c: *Сѣго прѣпѣбнаго ѿца нѣшего нсхнѣа презвѣтера нѣрѣльмьскааго поуученнѣа. Inc.: Сѣрахѣ нмѣн бжнн любѣе. н ѹнсто кѣ всѣмѣ. свѣдѣтельство сѣвѣстнѣа нмѣн.* This is an excerpt from *Capita paraenetica*, but large parts of the text were omitted. At its end a *paterikon* text was added without a separate heading. The manuscript – written by a man of let-

³⁵ Veder 2005: 185–199.

³⁶ Veder 2008: 35.

ters with Serbian orthographic habits but directly from a Middle Bulgarian protograph – comprises of the Skete *Paterikon*, parts of *Vita Constantini*, the *Vita* of Andrew the Holy Fool, the *Vita* of Theodora of Alexandria, the Dormition of Theotokos by John the Theologian etc³⁷.

In the Slavic manuscript tradition there are other two variants of *Capita paraenetica* which are ascribed to Hesychius of Jerusalem. The first one is attached to the collection of wise phrases *Pčela* (Μέλισσα, The Bee) in a few Russian manuscripts, with its main representative Ms F.n.I.44, Russian National Library, St. Petersburg, 14th–15th century. It is published by Semenov³⁸ with different lexical readings after two other manuscripts (Ms 324/ 421 from the Synodical collection, State Museum of History, Moscow, 16th c., and Ms 1066 from Pogodin's collection, Russian National Library, St. Petersburg, 16th c.). It bares the name of Hesychius in its title: СЛОВЦА НЗБРАНА СГГО НСОУХННА ПРОЗВОУТЕРА НЕРЛНМЬСКѦ. Inc.: СТРАХЪ БЖН НМѢН ВСЕГДА Н ЖЕЛАННѢ НМѢН К НЕМОУ Н УТО СЪВѢДНТЕЛСТВО НМѢН КО ВСѢМЪ. According to Speranskij the Greek archetype in its full form is Παράινεσις (i.e. PG 79, 1252 B–1261 C and 1240 C–1249). The scholar points out numerous arguments in favour of the hypothesis that this was a separate translation, different from the one in the *Izbornik* of 1076.

M. N. Speranskij introduces in the scholarship a third translation when he publishes a 16th-century Russian copy: Ms 165/650 from the Synodical collection, State Museum of History, Moscow, 16th century, f 258r: СГГО ННЛА. ѿ прѣтѣуь его ко ннокѡ. ѧ. НЕВЪЗРЪЖАНІЕ БРАШЕНЪ ПРЕСѢЦАѢ ПОСТЪ. According to the researcher close to this copy are the following manuscripts: Ms 763 (1834) Trinity Sergius

³⁷ The Miscellany, bound in two volumes, does not have a published description. I use the typed description made by B. M. Tihomirov.

³⁸ Semenov 1892.

Lavra, Russian State Library, Moscow, 15th century, Russian in origin; Ms 171 (1674) from the same collection and library, 15th century, Russian in origin; Ms 404, National Library, Belgrade, burnt during World War II, 17th century, Serbian in origin.

The composition of the Greek archetype differs from the above mentioned – in its initial part it includes phrases from Παράινεσις πρὸς μοναχούς (PG 79 1235–1240) and then phrases from both Παράινεσις (PG 79 1250–1261) and Γνωμαί (PG 79 1240–1250). The style and the language of the *sententiae* also differ from those of the early translation. The same text is found in Ms 74 in the Library of the Romanian Academy of Sciences in Bucharest, 1460–1470, Moldavian in origin with Middle Bulgarian protograph, f 49r: НѢРЪЗДѢРЪЖАНІИѢ БРАШЕНЬ ПРѢСЪЦАѢ ПО НѢРЪЗДѢРЪЖАНІИѢ БЛѢДОУ ПРѢПННАѢ, as well as a later manuscript from the Synod Library in Bucharest, Ms II 280, 16th century, Moldavian in origin³⁹.

Even from a cursory glance it is clear that this group of texts goes back to a Middle Bulgarian translation of another Greek collection. It was ascetically oriented and found place in miscellanies with translations of authors related to the teaching of Hesychasm.

What is the place of the newly discovered translation of *Capita paraenetica* found in Hil 382 (in Ms 72 and Ms 310 in the Romanian Academy of Sciences respectively) among the ones enlisted above?

I already underlined that no major research on *Capita paraenetica* has taken in consideration these three South Slavic copies. As far as the composition goes, they omit – just as is the case in the *Kniazheski izborink* – the first 24 alphabetically ordered phrases which were tentatively named Κεφάλαια ἢ παραίνεσις (PG 79 1252 B –1260 C); then phrases 25 – 119 are consistently presented in them except for some minor omissions, additions of separate words and only one transposition (phrase 50 was placed

³⁹ Mircea 2005: 140.

between phrases 56 and 58). The second part of the text, entitled *НЧХЫЕРО СЛОБО* in the mentioned copies, fully corresponds to *Γνωμαὶ ἀπάγουσαι τῶν φθαρτῶν καὶ κολλῶσαι τοῖς ἀφθάρτοις τὸν ἄνθρωπον* (PG 79 1240 C – 1249 B) – phrases from 1 to 98. The order and the segmentation of the *sententiae* are the same as in the Greek copies in Mosq. Gr 126, Theol. Gr. 167 and Vatop. 38. The preliminary comparison shows that the closest copy is the one in Mosq. Gr 126; its detailed analysis and edition are yet to be done. This Greek copy – which quite closely follows the publication in PG – when juxtaposed to the text published by V. Semenov and in the *Izbornik* of 1076 – shows some differences to them.

The Slavic translations present in W. Veder's reconstruction of the *Kniazheski izbornik* (henceforth K) and the oldest copy of the text in *Melissa* or *Pčela* (henceforth P) are different from the translation under consideration (henceforth A) not only in volume but also in language:

- **1–23** in A correspond to **25–49** according to PG 1252 B–1253 A; the same phrases correspond to 1–23 in P but in the translation of P 29 and 30 as well as 39 and 40 are fused and in 12 there is an addition; in K 36, 37, 38 and 46 are omitted.
- **24–30** in A correspond to **51–57** according to PG 1253 B; these sentences correspond to 24–30 in P but there 49 and 50 fuse in the translation; K omits 52, 53 and 55; under 31 in A is phrase 50; this transposition is typical only for A.
- **32–60** in A correspond to **58–88** according to PG 1253 C–1256 D; A omits 59 and 63; the translation in P corresponds to phrases 31–59 but 80 is divided in two – 53 and 54, and 82 is missing; K omits 66, 67, 68, 73, 75 and 88.
- **61–70** in A correspond to **89–98** in PG 1257 A–B; they correspond to 61–71 in P; 96 is divided in two – 68 and 69; P ends here but with other phrases as Semenov has already pointed

out⁴⁰; K omits 93.

- **71–89** in A correspond to the Greek text **99–116**, PG 1257 A–B; K translates selectively: 101, 103, 104, 107, 109, 119, 125, 127–131 and 136–138.
- The second part, entitled *НѢХЪЛЫЕВО СЛОВО*, translated fully in A (1–98), is selectively presented in K: 2–4, 8, 10, 12, 22, 26–29, 40, 42, 47, 50–51, 53–55, 57–59, 63, 66, 76–77, 79, 78, 80–87, 89–91, 93–98⁴¹.

All this confirms the conclusion that A, P and K are separate translations which are related to different Greek variants.

The earliest copy of Hil 382 (ff 59a–60c), as I pointed out, is from the final part of the writing (and perhaps this is why it has not been noticed yet) in Ms 72 (ff 37r–43r) and Ms 310 (ff 101r–108r) from the Romanian Academy of Sciences. The text is fully preserved, undamaged and the readings correspond quite exactly to one another, which makes the reconstruction of its initial content easier. It is interesting that in the mentioned manuscripts the writing is placed in the same context as in the group of the Greek manuscripts: Gr 126, Russian State Library, Moscow, 12th century; Theol. Gr. 167, Austrian State Library Vienna, 14th century; Vatop. 38, 10th century. *Capita paraenetica* is found surrounded by four texts: a) the so-called *Florilegium Mosquense* (Hil 382 ff 60c–64c)⁴²; b) Collection of aphoristic instructions for moral perfection ordered after the Greek alphabet (*Capita alphabetica*, CPG 6082) (Hil 382 ff 64c–66d)⁴³; c) Short instruction

⁴⁰ Semenov 1892: 90, n. 1.

⁴¹ For the juxtaposition see: Veder 2008: 43–48. I am grateful to the author for presenting me with the results of his work before the actual publishing of the *K'nezhii izbor'nik*.

⁴² The columns in the written margin are marked with a, b (on folio r) and c, d (on folio v).

⁴³ Miltenova 2009.

concerning both gratefulness to God and prayer – it is an excerpt from Basil the Great's homily about Iulitta the martyr (In *martirem Iulittam*, CPG 2849, PG 31, 244 A 15–244 D 5) (Hil 382 ff 66d–67b) and d) Instruction on the Ten Commandments of God (an excerpt from *Constitutiones apostolorum*, goes back to *Didache*) (in Hil 382 is presented in a fragment: ff 67b–67c-d, without an end)⁴⁴. These writings enter the first part of Hil 382 (ff 1–197) where the creators of the protograph followed the arrangement of the Greek original. The four listed texts, together with *Capita paraenetica* form a stable combination in the branch of the Greek copies, marked with *v* according to the classification of A. Guillaumont and C. Guillaumont as already mentioned.

The newly discovered translation A (which came down to us in its fullest copy in Ms 310 in the Romanian Academy of Sciences and is used below for the comparison) has the same linguistic peculiarities as *Florilegium Mosquense* and the Instruction on the Ten Commandments of God, found next to the same manuscripts which I have dealt with in another paper⁴⁵. Characteristic for this translation is the striving for exact, even word-for-word rendering of the Greek in spite of some errors in the Slavic copies. Complex rhetorical figures, idiomatic expressions and metaphoric parallels were all avoided here. Even a cursory glance when comparing the translations shows that they were made at the same epoch, which is also confirmed by their linguistic peculiarities.

⁴⁴ Miltenova 2008; Excerpts from *Constitutiones apostolorum* and more precisely from Book VII are included in a number of Byzantine writings of the type of *Florilegia*, which means also in the questions and answers of Athanasius of Sinai (PG, 89, 1860, col. 472–476). They are translated within the *Izbornik* of 1073 and are included in the *Kniazheski izbornik* as well as in the *Izbornik* of 1076; see Veder 2008: 66–71.

⁴⁵ Miltenova 2006: 320–326.

⁴⁶ Because of the limited volume of the paper here I give just some excerpts from the text.

Ἐν ταῖς νόσοις, τῇ προσευχῇ πρὸ τῶν ιατρῶν καὶ φαρμάκων κέχρησο.	Въ болѣзнихъ мѣтвѣю къ вѣраю и къ лѣкоуѣщюмоу вѣсѣдоуи.	Въ ѡзбыцѣ (!) прѣже вѣраѡ нмѣн мѣтвѣю.	Въ болѣзнь вѣраѡстѣо нмѣн мѣтвѣю и вѣраѡ вѣ.
Ἔργον εἶναι τοῦ νόμου τήν ἀνάγνωσιν νόμιζε, ὅταν μετὰ τῆς γλώττης ὁ νοῦς τρυγῆσαι τι θέλων, ἐν ταῖς βίβλοις ἐργάζεται.	Дѣлоу быти закона мни поунтаніе. ѿѡ ѣзыкѣ съ оумомъ въѣматн ҃то хоте въ кннгахъ дѣлаетъ.	Дѣло законъноіе мни ҃теннне кннжъноіе. іѣгда бо оумъ съ ѡзбыкъмъ къто хочетъ нцѣантн. то въ кннгы вѣнннѣ помннаете іѣго.	Дѣло законноіе кннгы ѡзѡумѣн. іѣгда бо оумъ съ ѡзбыкъ пѡдъ блгѣ въѣнматн хощетъ, въ кннгѣ да дѣлаетъ.
Ὅταν λοιδορηθῆς, σκοπεῖ μὴ τί σοι τῆς λοιδορίας πέπρακται ἄξιον. εἰ δὲ οὐ πέπρακται, καπνὸν εἶναι φεύγοντα τὴν λοιδορίαν νομίζε.	Ѧѡ оукорень боудешн. расмотрн ѣда ҃то оукореніа дѡнно с'творено ѣ. аще лн нѣ с'творена днмъ оукореніамн.	Іѣгда та океветаютъ ѡзѡумѣн. ѣда іѣ ҃то до тебе въ клеветъ тон. аште лн нѣсть. то мни акы дымъ расхѡдѡтѣ сѡ клеветѣю.	Іѣгда ѡклеветанъ вѣдешн. блѡдн, ѣда тн ҃то сѣдѣлаано бѣ ѡклеветанннѣ дѡнно.
Ἐν οἷς ἀδικῇ, τῇ ὑπομονῇ πρόσφευγε, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἀδικοῦντας ἡ βλάβη μεθίσταται.	Въ ннх'же въбднмъ есн къ трѣпѣнню прнѣган. и къ въбдѣщн" вѣдѣ прѣстоупнтъ.	Іѣгда обнднмъ іесн. пѡдѣбѣган къ трѣпѣнню. и трѣпѣннне твоѣ вѣднтъ вбндащѡ та и оустронтъ.	Аще нн сѣдѣѡ ѡклеветанннѣ дѡстѡннаго, ѡ ннх'же вбндоу прнѣмашн, къ терѣпѣнню прнѣган, и ко вбндащнмъ пѡкѡсть ѡзѡратнтъ сѡ.

Interesting are some rare words known from only a few Bulgarian monuments, e.g.: прѣвѣса 'scales' translates ζυγός 'yoke' and 'scales'⁴⁷, cf. въ пѣчалнѣ блѡдарѣствыи прѣвѣса грѣхов'на лѣгѡаетъ (ὁ ζυγὸς τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν) but п'цн се ѡ соудннѣх прѣвѣсахъ (Μερίμνα τοῦ Κριτοῦ ζυγόν); върозь (probably from възорь?) 'appearance' (βλέμμα,

⁴⁷ The word is used to signify the Libra constellation in the translations of the Erotapokriseis of Pseudo-Kaisarios, see Милтенов 2006: 254.

the same meaning in the Slavonic translation of the Vita of Theodor Studites)⁴⁸; the adjective ТΟΥΓАНЪ (ТѢГАНЪ) ‘neglectful’ in the phrase НЕ БОУДѢН О ДѢЛАНІИ ЗАПОВѢДНѢМЪ ТΟΥΓАНЪ (ὀλίγωρος) appears only in Sinai *Paterikon* but in a different meaning⁴⁹; ИСКΟΥСЪ ‘temptation’ (πειρασμός) as an extremely interesting Bible allusion МЛН СЕ НЕ ВЪПАСТИ ВЪ ИСКΟΥСѢ (Tetraevangelia of Dobril of the year 1164, Russian State Library, Rum. 103; a 12th-century Sticharion and some others)⁵⁰. The verb ЛНХОПНТАТИ СѦ ‘to overeat’ (τροφάω) is not present in the dictionaries known to me; ПЕУАТЛѢТИ ‘to seal’ (σφραγίζειν) is used metaphorically: ВЪСЕ ДѢЛО МЛТВОЮ ПЕУАТЛѢВАН (in the *Izbornik* of 1076: ВЪСАКО ДѢЛО МЛТВОЮ ПЕУАТЛѢВАН) etc.

Other lexemes are found mainly in early monuments whose translation is related to the Old Bulgarian period, for instance the often appearing combinations БЛАГА ДѢТЕЛЪ ‘benefactor’ (ἀρετή), as well as БЛАГО ДѢЛО (ДѢЛА БЛГАНА, БЛГЫХЪ ДѢЛѢХЪ)⁵¹; КОТОРНЪ ‘quarrelsome’ (μάχιμος) (in the *Izbornik* of 1073 г., the 13 Orations of Gregory the Great etc); ГВОРЪ ‘bladder’ (πομφόλυξ) (in *Hexaemeron* of John the Exarch, *Erotapokriseis* of Pseudo-Kaisarios, Pandects of Antioch, *Melissa* (*Pčela*) etc)⁵²; ОΥКОРΗΖНА ‘impudence’ (ὕβρις) (in Pandects of Antioch, *Efremovskaja Kormchaia* etc.); ОΥΚΟΡΕΝНІЕ ТВОРИТИ ‘to cause offence’ (from the καθυβρίζω) (in the *Ustužkaja Kormchaia*, the Ladder, Basil the Great’s instructions etc.)⁵³ in the expression

⁴⁸ Slovar’ 1989, II: 96; I thank to my colleague Mariya Yovcheva for this information.

⁴⁹ Sreznevskij 1893–1912, III: 1032.

⁵⁰ Sreznevskij 1893–1912, I: 1122.

⁵¹ For the uses in monuments from the 9th-10th century see Miltenov 2006: 192–193.

⁵² Bojadžiev 2005: 13–18.

⁵³ Sreznevskij 1893–1912, III: 1181.

εΔΑ ΥΤΟ ΟΥΚΟΡΕΝΙΑ ΔΩΗΝΟ ΕΤΩΡΕΝΟ Ε; ВЪСΧΛΑЩАТИ 'restrain, prevent' (χαλινούν) (it is found in the *Izbornik* of 1073, the Slepčė Epistles, the Pandects of Antioch, *Zlatostruj* in a 12-century copy, Homiliary of Mihanovič etc)⁵⁴, often in imperative: ВЪСΧΛΑЩАН; the verb ПЪВАТИ 'trust' (θαρρεῖν) (in *Codex Supraliensis*, the *Izbornik* of 1073, the 13 Orations of Gregory the Theologian, the Pandects of Antioch etc), the verb ЩЕДѢТИ (ЩАДѢТИ) 'protect oneself' (φείδεσθαι) (in Grigorič's *Prophetologion*, Lobkov's *Prophetologion* etc); ПЛНЩЬ 'noise' (κραυγή) (it is mentioned in *Codex Supraliensis*); the adjective ТОУЖДЬ (ЩОУЖДЬ), ἄλλοτρίας, in the expression ТОУЖАНА БО ПЛѢВЕЛЬ ГОРЬУАНША (in *Psalterium Sinaiticum*, Ohrid Epistles, Lobkov's *Prophetologion*, *Codex Supraliensis* etc) and some others.; КОТОРА 'quarrel' in the expression ЛЮБНЕЗЬ КОТОРЪ (φιλόνομος 'quarrelsome'); the verb НАСМΗΣАТИ 'mock' (γέλομαι) in the expression НАСМΗΣАН СЕ ЖИТЕНСКОМУ КОΛΟΥ)⁵⁵ etc. There are some specific rendering decisions, e.g. СЛАВА 'glory' translates δυναστεία 'power, authority'; ЦВѢТЬ 'flower' translates ρόδον 'rose'; ПЪПРНЩЕ translates στάδιον in the idiomatic expression ЖИТѢНСКОЕ ПЪПРНЩЕ etc.

My colleague D. Getov and I have made an attempt to cast new light on both the content and sources of part of the texts in Hil 382, Ms 72 and Ms 310 in the Romanian Academy of Sciences and more precisely on the *Florilegium* entitled ΡΑΖΥΜΗ ΔΨΗΠΟΛΕΖΗΗ ΣΤΥΙΧΉ ΩΨΪ. Η ΒΥΝΕΨΗΝΗΧΉ ΦΪΛΟΣΟΦΪ (Γινώμαι ψυχωφελείς ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ μεγάλων πατέρων)⁵⁶, placed next to the text under consideration. Here I am going to briefly repeat our conclusion: the *Florilegium* which comprises 166 short instructions and *sententiae*

⁵⁴ For an overview of the uses in the early translations see Miltenov 2006: 232–233.

⁵⁵ Sreznevskij 1893–1912, II: 334.

⁵⁶ Miltenova, Getov 2002: 305–320.

(γνωμαί) was translated in Bulgaria in the 10th century. This translation came down to us in Hil 382 and in the manuscripts in Bucharest. The similar linguistic peculiarities of *Capita paraeneteica* and their surrounding texts in the same manuscript (ff 1–92) imply the impression that they were translated by one and the same person at the same time. The chronology of this translation's origin is identical to the one of the *Izbornik* of 1073 which is seen when juxtaposing the text of the Instruction on the Ten Commandments of God, copied in Hil 382 in two different translations – once as a separate work (ff 67b–67c-d, without an end) and once as part of the questions and answers of Athanasius of Sinai⁵⁷. The same conclusion is reached after comparing *Capita paraeneteica* with the translation of the *Kniazheski izbornik* (its earliest copy is in the *Izbornik* of 1076). The time of the newly discovered translation, which is under consideration in this paper, could be hypothesised around the 10th century, the so-called 'late Preslav'. It may well be claimed that this translation preserved established (or preferred) peculiarities of the paraenetic literature, which originated in the Bulgarian monasteries in Eastern Bulgaria. Such a conclusion is supported also by the analysis of the *Capita paraeneteica*'s content. An indirect clue towards the time of its translation is the calculation of the time when the Second Coming of Christ and the Doomsday would take place; it is found in an excerpt with an eschatological interpretation bearing the name of Hippolytus of Rome, entitled: *Слѡ Полнта Римьскаго ѿ тълкованнѣ Данилаева* (f 36b–36d). In the text, placed close to the combination of five texts, it is said that: *ПОДОБАЕЪТЪ УАІАТИ ПРНШЬСТВНІА ГНА ВЪ ПРЪПОЛОВАЕННІЕ СЕДЬМЪНІЕ ТИСЦЕ*, i.e. in the year 992 г. (if the coefficient is 5508) or in the year 1000 (if the coefficient is 5500). Calculations of this kind were

⁵⁷ Miltenova 2008: 483–493.

pressing in the last decades of the 10th century and spread in both Byzantium and Bulgaria⁵⁸. This circumstance to a certain extent supports the assumption that not only the separate translations of the texts (including *Capita paraenetica*) but also the composition of this part of the protomiscellany as a whole (with its earliest copy Ms 382 in the Hilandar Monastery) could be related to the late 10th century and to be linked to the ruling of Tsar Petăr (927–970).

In conclusion to the existing preliminary studies we could draw the following history of the translations of *Capita paraenetica*, possibly belonging to the works of Evagrius Ponticus:

1) In Bulgaria in the 10th century were made at least two translations of this writing, one of which (with the name of Hesychius) is included in the composition of the so-called *Kniazheski izborink*; its earliest copy that came down to us is the *Izbornik* of 1076; the second translation (with the name of Nilus) was most probably carried out in a monastic environment not later than the days of Tsar Petăr.

2) In Bulgaria, probably in the 14th century, was made a third translation of the wise phrases according to another composition of the Greek text which is included in the ascetic miscellanies.

3) The comparative analysis of the Old Bulgarian translations of *Capita paraenetica*, on the one hand, and the text attached to *Melissa* (*Pčela*) in Russian manuscripts, on the other, shows that there are both similarities and differences in the translations. The origins of the Slavic translation of *Melissa*, i.e. *Pčela* (which has been considered Russian in origin but there have been opinions opposite to that)⁵⁹ cannot be regarded as a definitely settled matter. It requires new research based on new evidence from the Slavic manuscript tradition. Another hypothesis is that *Capita*

⁵⁸ Ševčenko 2002, 561–578.

⁵⁹ Thomson 1999b, V: 337–338; Pichhadze, Makeeva 2008: 7–8.

paraenetica was translated separately from *Melissa*, and later on was integrated into it.

Literature cited:

- Bibikov 1996: Биби́ков, М. В. Византийски прототип древнейшей славянской книги (Изборник Святослава 1073 г.). Москва, 1996.
- Bogdanovich 1978: Богдановић, Д. Каталог ћирилских рукописа манастира Хиландара. Београд, 1978.
- Bojadzhiev 2005: Бояджиев, А. О славянских словах со значением 'водяной пузырь'. – *Dissertationes slavicae. Sectio linguistica*. XXVI, Szeged, 2005, 13–18.
- Bulanin 1990: Буланин, Д. М. Неизвестный источник Изборника 1076 года. – *ТОДРЛ*, 44, 1990, 161–178.
- Fronton du Duc 1624: Fronton du Duc. *Bibliotheca veterum Patrum*. Vol. 1–2. Paris, 1624.
- Getov 2006: Getov, D. *Florilegium Mosquense: an Edition*. – *Revue d'histoire des textes*, n.s., 1, 2006, 1–36.
- Guillaumont 1971: Guillaumont A., C. Guillaumont. *Évagre le Pontique, Traité pratique ou Le moine*. T. 1 [*Sources chrétiennes* 170]. Paris, 1971, 272–539.
- Harmless, William. *Desert Christians: An Introduction to the Literature of Early Monasticism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Hunger, Kresten 3/2 1984: Hunger, H. Kresten, O. *Katalog der Griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*. T. 3/2. *Cod. Theol.* 101–200. Wien, 1984.
- Istorija 2008: История на българската средновековна литература. София, Изток-Запад, 2008.
- Istrin 1896: Истрин, В. М. Отчет командированного за границу

- приват-доцента Московского университета Василия Истрина за вторую половину 1894 года. – ЖМНП, ч. 304, апрель, 1896, № 4, отд. III, 47–63; ч. 307, № 9, 1–25; ч. 308, № 11, 1–41.
- Ivanova 1979: Иванова, Кл. За Хилендарския препис на първия Симеонов сборник. – Старобългарска литература, 5, 1979, 57–96.
- Ivanova 2003: Иванова, Кл. Преводната литература в България през IX–X век. – Кирило-Методиевска енциклопедия, т. 3, 2003, 290–298.
- Izbornik 1965: В. С. Голышенко, В. Ф. Дубровина, В. Г. Демьянов, Г. Ф. Нефедов. Изборник 1076 года. Москва, 1965.
- Jagich 1892: Јагић, В. Разум и филозофија из српских књижевних старина. – Споменик Српске Краљевске Академије, XIII, 1892,.
- Kuzidova 2003: Kuzidova, I. A Glance at Medieval South Slavonic Anthologies of Wise Sentences (Genre Peculiarities, Terminology and Text Heading). – Scripta & e-Scripta, 1, 2003, 175–185.
- Lavrov 1899: Лавров, П. А. Апокрифические тексты. – СОРЯС, т. 67, кн. 3, 1899.
- Marti 1986: Marti, R. W. Gattung Florilegien. – In: Gattungsprobleme der älteren slavischen Literaturen (= Veröffentlichungen der Abteilung für Slavischen Sprachen und Literaturen des Osteuropa-Instituts (Slavischens Seminar) an der Freien Universität Berlin 55), Berlin, 1984.
- Matejic 1976: Matejic, M. Hilandar Slavic codices: a checklist of the Slavic manuscripts from the Hilandar Monastery (Mount Athos, Greece). Columbus, Ohio, 1976.
- Matejic, Thomas 1992: Matejic, P., H. Thomas. Catalog. Manuscripts on Microform of the Hilandar Research

- Library (The Ohio State University). 1. Columbus, Ohio, 1992.
- Mennes 1971: Mennes, R. Hesychius von Jerusalem: Inventaris van de Griekse handschriftelijke overlevering met de uitgave en vertaling van het groot commentaar op psalm 100 en 102. Univ. Gent, 1971 (Dissertation).
- Mihaila 1977: Михаила, Г. Две копии Симеонова сборника в библиотеке Румынской академии. – В: Nachtigalov sbornik. Ljubliana, 1977, 255–280.
- Mihaila 1987: Михаила, Г. Списки Сборника царя Симеона в библиотеке Румынской академии. – *Palaeobulgarica*, 1987, № 3, 3–20.
- Miltenov 2006: Милтенов, Я. Диалозите на Псевдо-Кесарий в славянската ръкописна традиция. С., 2006.
- Miltenova 2000: Милтенова, А. Ранният флорилегий от Хиландарския сборник № 382 и българо-сръбските книжовни връзки през Средновековието. – В: Осам векова Хиландара. Исторја, духовни живот, књижевност, уметност и архитектура (Научни скупове САНУ, књ. ХCV, Одељење историјских наука, књ. 27), 2000, 319–324.
- Miltenova 2006: Милтенова, А. Към въпроса за многократните преводи и редакции в състава на монашеските флорилегии. – В: Многократните преводи в Южнославянското средновековие. Доклади от международната конференция, София, 7–9 юли 2005 г. София, 2006, 309–312.
- Miltenova 2007: Милтенова, А. Към въпроса за катехитичната литература в контекста на Кирило-Методиевата епоха. – В: Проблеми на Кирило-Методиевото дело и на българската култура през IX–X в. [Кирило-Методиевски студии, т. 17], 2007, 484–495.

- Miltenova 2008: Милтенова, А. Раннехристианское “Поучение о десяти Божиих заповедях” и его славянские переводы. – В: К 70-летию доктора филологических наук, профессора Гелиана Михайловича Прохорова. Санкт Петербург., 2008. [ТОДРЛ, т. 58], 458–493.
- Miltenova 2009: Милтенова, А. Неизвестно паренетично съчинение по формата на азбучен акростих (предварително проучване) – В: Средновековието в огледалото на един филолог. Сборник в чест на Светлина Николова [Кирило-Методиевски студии, 18], 2009, 352-367.
- Miltenova, Getov 2002: Милтенова, А., Д. Гетов. Византийският паметник “FLORILEGIUM MOSQUENSE” и неговите славянски преводи. – В: Международна конференция “Византийското културно наследство и Балканите”, септември, 6–8, 2001, Пловдив. Пловдив, 2002, 305–320.
- Mircea 2005: Mircea, I. R. Répertoire des manuscrits Slaves en Roumanie auteurs Byzantins et Slaves. Rév. du texte slave P. Bojčeva. Rév. du texte français Sv. Todorova. Sofia, 2005.
- Orellius, Iohan Conradus. Opuscula graecorum veterum sententiosa et moralia. Graece et Latine. Lipsiae, Tomus primus. 1819.
- Panaiteacu 1959: Panaiteacu, P. P. Manuscrisele Slave din Biblioteca Academiei RPR. 1. București, 1959.
- Panaiteacu 2003: Panaiteacu, P. P. Catalogul manuscriselor slavo-române și slave din Biblioteca Academiei Române. 2. București, 2003.
- Papoulidis 1981: Papoulidis, K. K. Συνοπτική ἀναγραφὴ ἐλληνικῶν χειρογράφων καὶ ἐγγράφων τῆς Βιβλιοθήκης Lenin τῆς Μόσχας. – Θεολογία, LII, 1981, 481–499.
- Pichhadze, Makeeva 2008: “Пчела”. Древнерусский перевод.

- Изд. А. А. Пичхадзе, И.И. Макеева. 1. Москва, 2008.
- Richard 1964: Richard, M. *Florilèges spirituels grecs*. – In: *Dictionaire de Spiritualité*, 5, 1964, coll. 475–512 (497) (= *Opera Minora*, 1, Turnholt-Leuven, no. 1).
- Sakkelion 1890: Sakkelion, I. Πατμιακὴ βιβλιοθήκη ἤτοι ἀναγραφὴ τῶν ἐν τῇ βιβλιοθήκῃ τῆς κατὰ τὴν νῆσον Πάτμον γεραρᾶς καὶ βασιλικῆς μονῆς τοῦ Ἀγίου Ἀποστόλου καὶ Εὐαγγελιστοῦ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Θεολόγου τεθησαυρισμένων χειρογράφων τευχῶν. Athen, 1890.
- Sava Chilandarec 1897: Sava Chilandarec. *Rukopisy a starotisky Chilandarské*. Popisuje Sava Chilandarec. Úvod upravil a ukazatelem opatžil Fr. Partnek. – *Věstník královské české společnosti nauk*, roč. VI (1896), Praha, 1897, 1–98.
- Semenov 1892: Семенов, В. Изречения Исихия и Варнавы по русским спискам. – *Памятники древней письменности*, 92, 1892, 1–25.
- Semenov 1893: Семенов, В. Греческий источник “Изречения Исихия”. – *ЖМНП*, ч. 288, 1893, июль, 84–93.
- Ševčenko 2002: Ševčenko, I. Unpublished Byzantine Texts on the End of the World about the Year 1000 AD. – In: *Mélanges Gilbert Dagron* (= *Travaux et Mémoires*, 14), Paris, 2002, 561–578.
- Sinkewicz 2003: Evagrius of Pontus: The Greek Ascetic Corpus. Translated by Robert E. Sinkewicz. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Slovar’ 1989, II: Словарь древнерусского языка (XI–XIV вв.). Т. II. Гл. ред. Р. И. Аванесов. АН СССР. Ин-т русского языка. Москва, 1989.
- Speranskij 1904: Сперанский, М. Н. Переводные сборники изречений в славянорусской письменности. Исследование и текст. Москва, 1904.
- Sreznevskij 1893–1912: Срезневский, И. И. Материалы для

- словаря древнерусского языка по письменным памятникам. Т. I–IV. Санкт Петербург, 1893–1912.
- Tarnanidis 1988: Tarnanidis I. The Slavonic Manuscripts Discovered in 1975 at St. Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai. Thessaloniki, 1988.
- Thomson 1993: Thomson, F. The Symeonian Florilegium – Problems of Its Origin, Content, Textology and Edition, Together with an English Translation of the Eulogy of Tzar Symeon. – *Palaeobulgarica*, XVII, N 1, 1993, 37–53.
- Thomson 1999a: Thomson, F. The Nature of the Reception of Christian Byzantine Culture in Russia in the Tenth to Thirteenth Centuries and Its Implication for Russian Culture. – In: Thomson, F. The Reception of the Byzantine Culture in Medieval Russia. Farnborough, 1999, 107–139.
- Thomson 1999b: Thomson, F. "Made in Russia". A Survey of the Translations allegedly made in Kievan Russia. – The Reception of the Byzantine Culture in Medieval Russia. Farnborough, 1999, V, 295–354.
- Veder 2005a: Veder, W. The Izbornik of the John the Sinner: a Compilation from Compilations. – In: Федер, У. Хиляда години като един ден. Животът на текстовете в православно славянство. София, 2005, 185–199.
- Veder 2005b: Veder, W. Literature as a Kaleidoscope: The Structure of Čet'i Sborniki. – In: Федер, У. Хиляда години като един ден. Животът на текстовете в православно славянство. София, 2005, 102–109.
- Veder 2008: Федер, Ч. Кънажи и изборникъ за възпитание на канартикина. 1-2. Велико Търново, 2009.
- Ταρνανίδης 1996: Ταρνανίδης Ι. Το Άγιο Όρος ανάμεσα στο Βυζάντιο και στους Σλάβους – In: Το Άγιο Όρος, χτες-σήμερα-αύριο. Διεθνές Συμπόσιο Εταιρείας Μακεδονικών Σπουδών, Θεσσαλονίκη 29 Οκτ.-1 Νοε. 1993. Θεσ-

σαλονίκη, 1996, 337–346.

Ταρνανίδης 2004: Ταρνανίδης Ι. Σελίδες από την Εκκλησιαστική γραμματεία των Σλάβων. Θεσσαλονίκη, 2004.

Abbreviations

ЖМНП – Журнал Министерства народного просвещения

ТОДРЛ – Труды Отдела древнерусской литературы

СОРЯС – Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности

САНУ – Српска Академија наука и уметности

CPG – Clavis Patrum Graecorum

PG – Patrologia Graeca

**ΣΧΕΤΙΚΑ ΜΕ ΤΙΣ ΣΛΑΒΙΚΕΣ ΜΕΤΑΦΡΑΣΕΙΣ
ΤΩΝ ΠΑΡΑΙΝΕΤΙΚΩΝ ΚΕΦΑΛΑΙΩΝ ΤΩΝ
ΑΠΟΔΙΔΟΜΕΝΩΝ ΣΤΟΝ ΝΕΙΛΟ ΑΓΚΥΡΑΣ
Η ΣΤΟΝ ΗΣΥΧΙΟ ΙΕΡΟΣΟΛΥΜΩΝ**

Στη μελέτη αυτή για πρώτη φορά δημοσιεύονται στοιχεία μιας άγνωστης σλαβικής μετάφρασης ενός έργου που περιέχει σοφές ρήσεις, οι οποίες αποδίδονται τόσο στον Νείλο τον Σιναΐτη όσο και στον Ησύχιο τον Ιεροσολυμίτη. Ουσιαστικά το κείμενο ανήκει στον Ευάγριο Ποντικό (περίπου 345-399) και είναι γνωστό στην επιστημονική βιβλιογραφία υπό τον τίτλο *Capita paraenetica*. Αποτελείται από δύο μέρη: α) *Sententiae. Inc.*: Φόβον ἔχε θεοῦ καὶ πόθον (CPG 6583a, PG 79: 1252-1262) και β) *Sententiae abducentes hominem a corruptibilibus. Inc.*: Ὁδός εἰς ἀρετήν, ἢ τοῦ βίου φυγή (CPG 6583b, PG: 1240-1250). Το έργο βρίσκεται σε μοναστικούς σύμμεικτους κώδικες του τύπου “*florilegia*” από την πολύ πρώιμη εποχή.

Όπως διαπιστώνεται, τον 10^ο αιώνα στη μεσαιωνική Βουλγαρία είχαν πραγματοποιηθεί τουλάχιστον δύο μεταφράσεις του έργου αυτού. Η πρώτη από αυτές περιλαμβάνεται στο λεγόμενο *Ηγεμονικό Isbornik* που έφτασε ως τις μερες μας στο πολύ πρώιμο ρωσικό αντίγραφο του *Isbornik* του 1076, ενώ η δεύτερη μετάφραση πιθανότατα πραγματοποιήθηκε σε μοναστικό περιβάλλον όχι αργότερα από την περίοδο της βασιλείας του τσάρου Πέτρου. Πιθανώς τον 14^ο αιώνα στη Βουλγαρία πραγματοποιήθηκε και νέα βουλγαρική μετάφραση (τρίτη στη σειρά) των σοφών ρήσεων σύμφωνα με άλλη, διαφορετική σύνθεση του ελληνικού κειμένου, το οποίο περιλαμβάνεται

στους σύμμεικτους κώδικες με ησυχαστικό προσανατολισμό. Σύμφωνα με αυτή, γίνεται μια πρώτη ανάλυση των βουλγαρικών μεταφράσεων του έργου *Capita paraenetica* από τη μία μεριά και των ρήσεων στη σύνθεση του σύμμεικτου κώδικα με τον τίτλο “Μέλισσα” από την άλλη. Υπάρχουν τόσο ομοιότητες στη γλώσσα της μετάφρασης όσο και διαφορές. Το πρόβλημα της καταγωγής της σλαβικής μετάφρασης της “Μέλισσας” (που θεωρείται ρωσικής προέλευσης, αν και υπάρχουν αντίθετες απόψεις) δεν μπορεί να θεωρηθεί ότι αντιμετωπίστηκε οριστικά και απαιτεί περαιτέρω εξέταση με βάση το νέο αποδεικτικό υλικό που προκύπτει από τη σλαβική χειρόγραφη παράδοση.