At the Crossroads of Slavonic Compilations

William R. Veder

Independent scholar, Utrecht, The Netherlands

veder@sbcglobal.net

Abstract

Close examination of five compilations from texts previously translated into Slavonic (two of which are edited) and their interrelation leads to the recognition that they form part of a corpus with at least another eleven compilations (four of which are edited). This corpus, in size vastly surpassing that of original compositions in Slavonic, was written in Glagolitic script, which implies that it cannot have been created later than the beginning of the twelfth century.

Keywords

(Old Church) Slavonic – Glagolitic – Compilation from previous translations – Compilation technique

Literary scholarship usually treats compilations as the poor relations of ‘real’ literature for being limited to recycling texts created previously and muddling their associations, composition and meaning. Not so Norman Ingham: he drew my attention to the striking fact that the *Scaliger Patericon* of the tenth century was compiled using a technique of chaotisation, which came into its own only with computer-generated poetry at the end of the twentieth century.¹ I owe it to his memory to show that compilations have much insight to offer to the attentive reader and ought to be recognised as a valuable source for the history of language, literature and culture, some of them even as art in their own right.

1 See W.R. Veder, ‘Literature as a Kaleidoscope: the Structure of Chetii Sborniki,’ in U.R. Feder, *Hiliada godini kato edin den: zhivot”t na tekstovete v pravoslavnoto slavianstvo* (Sofia: Marin Drinov, 2005), 108.

An Exhortation on Reading

The third-oldest dated book in Rus', the *Izbornik of 1076*,² is unlike the *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary* of 1056–57 and the *Izbornik of 1073* (copied from the *Simeonov Izbornik*³) not a translated Greek but a Slavonic compilation (copied from the *Izbornik of John the Sinner*⁴). It opens with a well-known and very well-wrought⁵ exhortation on reading. I print it below under the siglum 'g' in normalised spelling and collate it with the *Zlatoust* (siglum 'z').⁶ To g and z I add their identified sources: i – the *Izmaragd*, version b, chapters 2 and 104,⁷ k – the *Kniazhii Izbornik*⁸ and s – the *Scete Patericon*, version 4, chapters G and 1.⁹

o (s G:11)

s Рече блаженъи иванъиъ златоустъиъ

i слово сватаго григориа папы римскаго

g слово нѣкоего калоугера о ѣтении кънигъ:

z слово иванъна златоустаго о почитании кънижномъ: благослови отъе:

1 (i 2:1)

i Добро естъ братие и полезно въсакомоу вѣрномуу почитание кънижное:

g Добро естъ братие почитание кънижное паце въсакомоу христианиноу:

z Добро естъ почитание кънижное паце въсакомоу христианиноу:

2 (i 2:2, Ps 118:2, 10)

2 New edition by M.S. Mushinskaia et al., *Izbornik 1076 goda. Vtoroe izdanie, pererabotannoe i dopolnennoe*, T. 1–2, (Moskva: Rukopisnye pamiatniki Drevnei Rusi, 2009).

3 Ed. P. Dinekov et al., *Simeonov sbornik (po Svetoslavoviia prepis ot 1073 g.)*, Vol. 1–3, (Sofia: Izd. Na Balgarskata Akad. na Naukite, 1991–2015).

4 Ed. U.R. Feder, *Kniazhii Izbornik za v"zpitanie na kanartikina*, Vol. 2, (Veliko T"rnovo: Sv. Sv. Kiril i Metodi, 2008); English translation in W.R. Veder, A.A. Turilov, *The Edificatory Prose of Kievan Rus'* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1994) (= *Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, English Translations*, Vol. VI).

5 See W.R. Veder, 'Three Old Slavic Discourses on Reading,' in Feder, *Hiliada...*, 130–138; for another well-wrought compilation, see Ya. Miltenov, 'Novi danni za Pouchenieto za spasenieto na dushata, pripisano na Chernorizec Pet"r,' *Starob"lgarska literatura* 51 (2015): 157–187.

6 In a reconstruction of the antigraph of two 16th c. copies in the Trinity–St Sergius Laura, viz. codd. Moskva RGB F.173.I nr. 146, f. 334v–338 and F.304.I nr. 142, f.221v–224v.

7 In a reconstruction of the antigraph of three 15–16th c. copies in the Trinity–St Sergius Laura, viz. codd. Moskva RGB F.173.I nr. 46, f.8–v, F.304.I nr. 202, f.2v–3v, and nr. 203, f.5–v.

8 Ed. Feder, *Kniazhii...*, Vol. 2.

9 Ed. W.R. Veder, *Skitskij Paterik*, Amsterdam 2012 (= *Pegasus Oost–Europese Studies* 14); for the compilation, see U.R. Feder, 'Kniazhij Izbornik i Izbornik na greshniia Joan sred rannite glagolicheski kompilacii,' in: A. Angusheva et al. (eds.). *Vis et sapientia: Studia in honorem Anisavae Miltenova*, (Sofia: Boian Penev, 2016), 395–419.

- i Блажени: бо рече: испытатиѣши съвѣдѣніа его·
 g Блажени: бо рече: испытатиѣши съвѣдѣніа его· въсѣмъ срьдыцемъ
 z Блажени: бо рече: испытатиѣши съвѣдѣніа его· въсѣмъ срьдыцемъ
 i
 g въззицѣтъ его·
 z въззицѣтъ его·
 3 (Ps 118:11)
 g Чѣто бо рече: испытатиѣши съвѣдѣніа его·
 z чѣто бо рече: испытатиѣши съвѣдѣніа его·
 4 (s G1:3–4)
 s кѣгда же чѣтеши... не тѣщи са листѣи тѣкъмо обрацати·
 g кѣгда чѣтеши кѣнигы: не тѣщи са брѣзо ицисти до дроугѣна
 z іавѣ рече: кѣгда чѣтеши кѣнигы: не тѣщи са брѣзо ицисти до дроугѣна
 s нѣ аще кѣтъ трѣбѣ: не лѣни са· нѣ дѣва кратѣи и три
 g главизны: нѣ порадоумѣи: чѣто глаголютъ кѣнигы и словеса та· и три
 z главизны: нѣ порадоумѣи: чѣто ти глаголютъ словеса та· и три
 s кратѣи прочитати грани·
 g кратѣи обрацати са о єдинои главизнѣ·
 z кратѣи обрацати са о єдинои главизнѣ·
 5 (i 2:8, Ps 118:11)
 i рече бо давидъ пророкъ· въ срьдыци моею съкрѣихъ словеса твоѣа·
 g Рече бо· въ срьдыци моею съкрѣихъ словеса твоѣа·
 z рече бо· въ срьдыци моею съкрѣихъ словеса твоѣа·
 i да не сѣгрѣшѣ тебѣ·
 g да не сѣгрѣшѣ тебѣ·
 z да не сѣгрѣшѣ тебѣ·
 6 (Ps 118:11)
 g Не рече: оустѣи тѣѣни изглаголахъ· нѣ и въ срьдыци съкрѣихъ·
 да не сѣгрѣшѣ тебѣ·
 z 10
 7
 g И порадоумѣаю оубо истинныѣ писаниа· правимъ кѣтъ ими·
 z и порадоумѣаю бо истинныѣ писаниа· правимъ кѣтъ ими·
 8 (i 2:9, Jas 3:3)
 i іакоже оузда конєи правитель кѣтъ· тако и чловѣкъ вѣстазаетъ са
 g Рекъ же· оузда конєи правитель кѣтъ и вѣздрѣжаніе·

10 The identical ending of verses 5 and 6 probably caused the accidental omission in z.

- z рекъ же оузда коневѣ нестѣ правитель и въздръжаніе·
 i отѣ поустошѣнѣи ихъ· слыша оу чениа сватаѣ·
 g правѣдѣникоу же кѣнигѣи·
 z правѣдѣникоу же кѣнигѣи·
 9 (Jas 3:4)
 g Не съставитѣ бо са корабль безъ гвозди· ни правѣдѣникъ бесъ почитаниа
 z не съставитѣ бо са корабль безъ гвозди· ни правѣдѣникъ бесъ почитаниа
 g кѣнижѣнаго·
 z кѣнижѣнаго·
 10 (i 2:10)
 i И такоже плѣненѣи ихъ оумъ въ своиѣ странѣ нестѣ· тако и имѣѣи страхъ
 g И такоже плѣнѣникоумъ оумъ стоитѣ оу родителѣ своихъ· тако и
 z и такоже оумъ стоитѣ плѣнѣникомъ оу родителѣи своихъ· тако и
 i божии въсегда мѣслистѣ о небесѣнѣи ихъ· и желаетѣ оу чениа слышати·
 g правѣдѣникоу о почитаниі кѣнижѣнѣмъ·
 z правѣдѣникомъ о почитаниі кѣнижѣномъ·
 11 (Ps 118:47)
 g 11
 z въ заповѣдѣхъ твоихъ поглѣмѣѣ са· и разоумѣѣи пѣти твоѣѣ· да не
 бѣдетѣ же намъ ни о чѣмъ же радости· ни о чѣмъ же веселѣнѣи ни о чѣмъ же
 глѣмѣи са· нѣ тѣкѣмо о почитаниі кѣнижѣномъ·
 12
 g Красота воиноу орѣжиѣи и кораблю вѣтрила· тако и правѣдѣникоу
 z красота воиноу орѣжиѣи и кораблю вѣтрила· тако и правѣдѣникоу
 g почитаниѣ кѣнижѣноѣ·
 z о почитаниі кѣнижѣномъ·
 13 (s G:2:4, Ps 118:18)
 s отъкрѣѣи оуи мои· и разоумѣѣи чѣудеса отъ закона твоего·
 g Отъкрѣѣи· бо рече· оуи мои· да разоумѣѣи чѣудеса отъ закона твоего·
 z отъкрѣѣи· бо рече· оуи мои· и разоумѣѣи чѣудеса отъ закона твоего·
 14 (Ps 118:19)
 g Оуи бо глаголетѣ разоумъ и сѣмѣислъ срьдѣчѣнѣи·
 z оуи бо глаголетѣ разоумъ и сѣмѣислъ срьдѣчѣнѣи·
 15 (s G:2:3, Ps 118:19)
 s не сѣкрѣѣи отъ мене заповѣди твоихъ·
 g И проче· Не сѣкрѣѣи отъ мене заповѣди твоихъ·
 z и проче· не сѣкрѣѣи отъ мене заповѣди твоихъ·

11 The identical ending of verses 11 and 12 probably caused the accidental omission in i.

16

g Разоумѣи· іако не отъ очино съкръзи· нъ отъ разоума и срѣдѣца·

z разоумѣи· іако не отъ очино съкръзи· нъ отъ разоума и срѣдѣца·

17a (i 2:11)

i слыши како ти пророкъ хоулитъ не почитайщаа ни послушайщаа оучениа·

g Тѣмъже и похоули не поучайщаа са·

z тѣмъже и похоули не поучайщаа са·

i (i 104:1)¹²

i съ тѣми възделѣи възити·

z тѣхъ же са тѣи причастити възделѣи·

ii (s 1:3)

s Рече блажензи григорин· іако трии сихъ проситъ богъ отъ всѣакого

z Рече блажензи григорин· іако трии сихъ проситъ богъ отъ всѣакого

s чловѣка· имѣща крыщение· вѣрзи правзи отъ доуша· и истинзи отъ

z чловѣка· имѣща крыщение· вѣрзи правзи отъ доуша· и истинзи отъ

s іазыка· и цѣломъдріа отъ тѣла·

z іазыка· и цѣломъдріа отъ тѣла·

iii (i 104:2–4 = k 9:43–45, 1 Cor 2:9)

i всѣа во· w чловѣче· отъ бога възприѣлъ єси· и разоумъ· и хъитрость·

k чловѣче· всѣа приѣлъ єси отъ бога· разоумъ хъитрость

z чловѣче· всѣа възприѣлъ єси отъ бога· разоумъ и сѣмъислъ и хъитрость

i и оумъ· и всѣа ти покорена сѣтъ· іаже въ горахъ· и іаже въ водахъ· и іаже

k и оумъ· и всѣа ти покорена сѣтъ· іаже на земли твоѣа сѣтъ· и въ горахъ·

z и оумъ· и всѣа ти покорена сѣтъ· іаже на земли твоѣа сѣтъ· и въ горахъ·

i на земли· и іаже по въздоуху тебѣ на пицѣхъ вѣдана сѣтъ· нъ да вѣси· іако

k и въ водахъ· и по въздоуху тебѣ на пицѣхъ вѣдана сѣтъ· нъ да вѣси· іако

z и въ водахъ· и по въздоуху тебѣ на пицѣхъ дана· нъ да вѣждь· іако

i въ заимъ дана ти сѣтъ· да аще господєи въздаси противъ сємоу правѣдъ·

k въ заимъ дана ти сѣтъ· да аще въздаси богови противъ сємоу правѣдъ·

z въ заимъ дана ти сѣтъ· да аще въздаси богови противъ сємоу правѣдъ·

i любѣвъ· кротость· сѣмѣреніе· странънолюбіе· милостъини· покореніе·

k кротость· сѣмѣреніе· любѣвъ и милостъини·

z любѣвъ· кротость· сѣмѣреніе и милостъини·

i безълюбіе· постъ· поклоненіе· то въздастъ ти и єще· ихъже око не видѣ·

12 This verse – the last of *Izmaragd* b 104:1 (see interpolation v below) – requires, of course, a positive antecedent. Its transfer to this place without negation is an error of the compiler of i.

- k то въздастъ тебѣ пакы противъ томоу· ихъже око не видѣ·
 z то въздастъ ти са пакы даромъ· ихъже око не видѣ·
 i и оухо не слыша· и на срѣдьце ѹловѣкоу не възиде· ꙗже оуготова богъ
 k и оухо не слыша· и ѹловѣкоу на срѣдьце не възиде· ꙗже богъ оуготова
 z и оухо не слыша· ни на срѣдьце ѹловѣкоу не възиде·
 i любацинимъ него· w ѹловѣче· на тръгоу житиисцѣмъ и ꙗще ꙗси· даже тръгъ
 k любацинимъ него· ѹловѣче· на тръгоу житиисцѣмъ ꙗси ꙗще· и даже тръгъ
 z ѹловѣче· на тръгоу житиисцѣмъ ꙗще ꙗси· и даже тръгъ
 i са не разидетъ· коупи си милостъꙗнеѣ помилование отъ бога·
 k не разидетъ са· коупи си милостъꙗнеѣ нициихъ помилование отъ бога· и
 z не разидетъ са· коупи си милостъꙗнеѣ нициихъ помилование отъ бога·
 i сѣмъбреніемъ вѣчѣнѣѣмъ славѣ· правдоѣмъ житіе неконѣѹаемоѣ· ѹистотоѣмъ
 k сѣмъбреніемъ вѣчѣнѣѣмъ славѣ· и правдоѣмъ житіе неконѣѹаемоѣ· ѹистотоѣмъ
 z сѣмъбреніемъ вѣчѣнѣѣмъ славѣ· правдоѣмъ житіе неконѣѹаемоѣ· ѹистотоѣмъ
 i вѣнѣць· троѹдомъ покои· кротостиѣмъ въ раи възхождение· молитвоѣмъ сѣ
 k вѣнѣць нетѣлѣнѣнѣи· кротостиѣмъ въ раи възхождение· молитвоѣмъ сѣ
 z вѣнѣць· кротостиѣмъ въ раи възхождение· молитвоѣмъ сѣ
 i анъгелъ пѣніе· коупи си бѣдѣніемъ лице
 k анъгелъ пѣніе· коупи себѣ троѹдомъ покои· и бѣдѣніемъ лице
 z анъгелъ пѣніе· коупи си троѹдомъ покои· бѣдѣніемъ лице
 i невидимаго бога· пощениемъ вѣчѣнѣнѣхъ благъ наслаждение·
 k невидимаго бога· постомъ и жаждѣѣмъ вѣчѣнѣнѣхъ благъ наслаждение·
 z невидимаго бога· постомъ и жаждѣѣмъ вѣчѣнѣнѣхъ благъ наслаждение·
 iv
 z ѹловѣче· да бѣдетъ ти въ главѣ оумъ· и сѣмъзсѣлъ цѣсарѣства
 небесѣнаго· въ очію же зѣрѣніе ꙗже горѣ· то къ богоу· а ꙗже долоу· то
 въ земліѣ· въ нѣже по малѣ поидѣши· въ оушеси же деснѣмъ слышание
 добро кѣнижѣнѣхъ словесъ· въ шоуѣмъ же слышание възплъ нициихъ въ
 ноздрию же въздѣхѣніе о грѣсѣхъ· въ ꙗзыцѣ же истина· въ оустѣнахъ
 молитва· въ десници же подаѣніе оубогѣимъ· въ шоуици же зѣла
 огрѣбѣніе· въ срѣдьци же безгнѣвіе· въ тѣлеси ѹистота· въ жѣтробѣ
 алъкота· въ колѣноу богоу падѣніе и къ богоу шѣствіе· молитвѣнѣи
 храмъ· да ꙗкоже тѣлесѣнѣи жѣдове тебѣ не отѣлѣжатъ са·
 17b (i 2:12, Ps 118:21)
 i проклати оукланѣѣщии са отъ заповѣди твоихъ· и зѣло оспѣдатъ са·
 g глагола· проклати оукланѣѣщии са отъ заповѣди твоихъ·
 z глаголетъ бо· проклати оукланѣѣщии са отъ заповѣди твоихъ·
 18 (i 2:13–14, Ps 118:103, 72)
 i и самъ са похвали глагола· коль сладъка грѣтани моемоу словеса
 g тѣмъже и самъ са похвали· глагола· коль сладъка словеса

- z тѣмъже и самъ са похвали· глагола· коль сладъка грѣтани моемоу словеса
 i твоѧ· паѣ меда оустомъ моимъ· и законъ оустъ твоихъ паѣ тѣсѣщъ
 g твоѧ· паѣ меда оустомъ моимъ· и законъ оустъ твоихъ паѣ тѣсѣща
 z твоѧ· паѣ меда оустомъ моимъ· и законъ оустъ твоихъ паѣ тѣсѣщъ
 i злата и сребра·
 g злата и сребра·
 z злата и сребра·
 19 (i 2:15, Ps 118:162)
 i и възпять глагола· въздарадоуѣ са азъ о словесехъ твоихъ· ꙗко обрѣтаѧ
 g И възпять глагола· въздарадоуѣ са азъ о словесехъ твоихъ· ꙗко обрѣтаѧ
 z и възпять глагола· въздарадоуѣ са азъ о словесехъ твоихъ· ꙗко обрѣтаѧ
 i користь мѣногъ·
 g користь мѣногъ·
 z користь мѣногъ·
 20 (i 2:16, Ps 1:2)
 i користь нареѣ словеса божѧ·
 g Користь бо нареѣ словеса божѧ· глагола· ꙗко обрѣтохъ· недостѡинъ сѣи·
 z користь бо нареѣ словеса божѧ· глагола· ꙗко недостѡинъ сѣи·
 g такъ даръ· еже ми са поуѣати словесемъ твоимъ днь и ноць·
 z такъ даръ обрѣтохъ· еже ми са поуѣати словесемъ твоимъ днь и ноць·
 21 (s G:1:4)
 g То мзи братѧ· порадоумѣимъ и послушаниъ разоумѣнѣма оушима· ꙗко
 z то мзи братѧ· порадоумѣимъ разоумѣнѣма оушима· и
 s да разоумѣѣши силъ ихъ·
 g порадоумѣимъ силъ и поуѣение свѣтънихъ кѣнигъ·
 z разоумѣѣмъ силъ и поуѣение свѣтънихъ кѣнигъ·
 22 (i 2:19)
 i велика ѣстъ польза оуѣения слѣшѣто свѣтаѣго василиѧ· ѡванъна
 g Послоушѧ тѣ житѧ свѣтаѣго василиѧ· и свѣтаѣго ѡванъна
 z послоушѧ тѣ житѧ свѣтаѣго василиѧ· и свѣтаѣго ѡванъна
 i златоустѣаѣго· ефрѣма· и кѣрилъла философа· инѣхъ
 g златоустѣаѣго· и свѣтаѣго кѣрилъла философа· и инѣхъ мѣногъ
 z златоустѣаѣго· и свѣтаѣго кѣрилъла философа· и инѣхъ мѣногъ
 i свѣтънихъ·
 g свѣтънихъ·
 z свѣтънихъ·
 23
 g Како ти сѣ прѣва повѣданѣтъ· о нихъ рекѣще· изъ млада прилежаахъ
 z како ти сѣ прѣва повѣданѣтъ· о нихъ рекѣще· како изъ млада прилежаахъ
 g свѣтънихъ кѣнигъ· таже и на добраѧ дѣла подвигнѣши са·

z сватѣиѣхъ кѣнигаѣхъ· тажде и на добраѣ дѣла подвигнѣша са·

24 (i 2:18)

i въсѣмъ бо дѣломъ добрымъ наѣло естѣ поучение сватѣиѣхъ

g виждѣ· како ти наѣатѣкъ добрымъ дѣломъ поучение сватѣиѣхъ

z виждѣ· како ти наѣатѣкъ добрымъ дѣломъ поучение сватѣиѣхъ

i кѣнигъ·

g кѣнигъ·

z кѣнигамъ·

25

g Да тѣми· братиѣ· мѣслѣми подвигнѣмъ са на пѣтъ житиѣ ихъ и на

z да тѣми· братиѣ· мѣслѣми подвигнѣмъ са на пѣтъ житиѣ ихъ и на

g дѣла ихъ· и поучаимъ са въ инѣ кѣнижнѣиѣмъ словесѣмъ· творѣце волѣхъ

z дѣла ихъ· и поучаимъ са въ инѣ кѣнижнѣиѣмъ словесѣмъ· творѣце волѣхъ

g ихъ· ѣкоже велѣтъ·

z божихъ· ѣкоже нѣи оучѣтъ·

26 (i 2:20)

g Да и вѣѣнѣиѣ жиѣни достоиѣи бѣдемъ въ вѣсѣ· аминъ·

z да вѣѣнѣиѣ жиѣни достоиѣи бѣдемъ·

v (i 104:1)

i наоучи са· вѣрѣиѣи ѣловѣѣ· бѣити благоѣстиѣ дѣлѣтель· наоучи са

z наоучи са· вѣрѣиѣи ѣловѣѣ· бѣити благоѣстиѣ дѣлѣтель· наоучи са

i жити по евангѣльскоѣмоу словеси· помѣслѣ ѣистѣ имѣи· и

z жити по евангѣльскоѣмоу словеси· оѣима оуправление· тѣлоу порабоѣение·

i оумъ сѣмѣренъ· гнѣвъ отѣложи· и понѣждаи са

z оумоу сѣмѣрение· помѣслѣ ѣистѣ имѣи· гнѣвоу потребаение· понѣждаи са

i на добраѣ дѣла· лишаѣмъ не мѣсти· постѣ и вѣздрѣжѣние вѣзлюбѣи·

z на добраѣ дѣла хриѣта ради· ненавиѣимъ любѣи· гонимъ тѣрпи· хоулимъ

i немѣного сѣпѣние· и поклѣнение·

z моли· оумѣрѣи гѣрѣхъ· расѣпи са сѣ хриѣтоу· и всѣхъ любѣвъ вѣзложи на

i да обраѣеши идеѣе анѣгѣлѣ тѣмъ· и прѣвѣнѣиѣ и

z господа· да обраѣеши идеѣе анѣгѣлѣ тѣмъ· и прѣвѣнѣиѣ сѣборѣи·

i апѣстѣлѣ сѣборѣи· патриѣрѣхъ жѣзлѣи· мѣѣениѣкѣ вѣнѣиѣи· и

z апѣстѣльсѣи прѣѣстѣли· жѣзлѣи патриѣрѣшѣсѣи· вѣнѣиѣи мѣѣениѣѣсѣи· и

i похѣлаѣ прѣвѣдѣнѣиѣхъ·

z похѣлѣи прѣвѣдѣнѣиѣхъ·

vi

z оубѣгъ мѣни са бѣити· а оутѣрѣ оумѣраѣи· и прѣхъ бѣѣѣѣи· глаголи· нѣсѣмъ

достѣиѣи· гѣѣиѣиѣи· ни на лиѣѣ ѣловѣѣкомъ зѣрѣѣи· да тѣмъ таѣѣѣѣи·

помѣиѣѣѣѣи· моѣеши бо са сѣпѣсти· о хриѣтѣ иѣоуѣсѣи· госѣѣѣи· наѣѣѣмъ·

иѣоуѣѣѣѣи· слаѣѣѣи· и ѣѣѣѣи· и дрѣѣѣѣѣи·

We can see three successive stages of compilation: first, the sources, viz. i, k (Slavonic compilations) and s (a Greek compilation), second, g itself, and third, its recipient z. But there is more than meets the eye, and a brief review of the closely related compilations, including one not yet mentioned, the *Minejnyj Izbornik*,¹³ is in order to get the full picture.

A The Minejnyj Izbornik

This compilation (ca. 38,000 words) contains a compilation from the Slavonic translations of the *Capitula adhortatoria* of Agapetus Diaconus, the *Manuale* of Epictetus in the version of Neilus of Ankyra,¹⁴ followed by 499 gnomes from works of an anonymous, a George, 'holy fathers', a Markianos, a Theodore, Basil the Great, Clement of Rome, Ephraem Syrus, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, Hesychius of Jerusalem, Hypatius, Isaac of Niniveh, Isidore of Pelusium, the Apostle James, John Cassian, John Chrysostom, John Climacus, John Damascene, John of Karpathos, Maximus Confessor, Neilus of Ankyra, patriarchs Gennadius I and Photius, Palladius of Helenopolis, Zosimas and from the *Vita* of a St. Olympius, and concluded by the *Prayer to the Virgin* of Peter the Monk.

B The Kniazhii Izbornik

This compilation¹⁵ (ca. 30,000 words) draws upon the *Minejnyj Izbornik* (for the *Capitula adhortatoria* and the gnomes), adding gnomes gleaned from the *Monostichis* of Menander, the *Simeonov Izbornik* (a translated Greek compilation), the *Izmaragd* and the Slavonic translations of the *Centuriae de caritate* of Thalassius, the *Quaestiones ad Antiochum* of a Pseudo-Athanasius, the *Quaestiones et responsiones* of Anastasius of Sinai, the *Sentences*, variously attributed to Hesychius of Jerusalem or Neilus of Ankyra, the sermon *De ascetica disciplina* of Basil the Great, the *Vitae* of St. Niphon of Constantia, St. Theodora of Alexandria and St. Xenophon, the deuterocanonical *Wisdom of Jesus, son of Sirach*, and two texts perhaps translated, but possibly compiled in Slavonic, viz. a *Centuria de fide* and a *Sermo patris ad filium suum*.¹⁶

13 See D.M. Bulanin, 'Neizvestnyi istochnik Izbornika 1076 goda,' *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoi literatury* 44 (1991): 161–178 and Mushinskaia, *Izbornik...*, Vol. 1, 52–54.

14 See D.M. Bulanin, *Antichnye traditsii v drevnerusskoi literature XI–XVI vv.* (München 1991) (= *Slavistische Beiträge* 278).

15 Ed. Feder, *Kniazhii...*, Vol. 2; for the compilation structure, see Vol. 1, 13–16.

16 Ed. W.R. Veder, 'A Certain Father's Edifying Words to His Son,' in Feder, *Hiljada...*, 139–144.

C The Izbornik of John the Sinner

The *Izbornik of 1076*¹⁷ is the only full copy of the *Izbornik of John the Sinner* (ca. 25,000 words). Its main source is the *Kniazhiu Izbornik* (of its fifteen chapters, it copies ten without significant alteration and another three in abridged and reshuffled form), adding the exhortation (collated above), an excerpt from an unidentified source and gnomes from the *Scete Patericon* versions α and γ , the *Scaliger Patericon*, the *Minejnyj Izbornik*,¹⁸ homilies by John Chrysostom and Basil the Great and the *Vita* of St. Martin of Tours.

D The Izmaragd

The *Izmaragd* is a compilation from a vast array of sources that exists in two loosely related versions, **a** (ca. 60,000 words) in ninety-two chapters and **b** (ca. 85,000 words) in 164 chapters.¹⁹ Both versions draw upon the same sources, translated from Greek (*Barlaam and Joasaph*, a set of gnomes from works of John Chrysostom, the *Epistle to Agathius* of Neilus of Ankyra, the *Pandect* of Antiochus the Monk, the *Paraenesis* of Ephraem Syrus, the *Quaestiones ad Antiochum* of a Pseudo–Athanasius, the *Scete Patericon*, the *Vita* of St. Niphon of Constantia and others to be identified) and compiled or composed in Slavonic (the *Discourse against the Bogumils* of Cosmas the Priest, the *Kniazhiu* or *Minejnyj Izbornik*,²⁰ the *Zlatostrui*). To these, version **a** adds the *Homilies* of Cyril the Monk and the *Simeonov Izbornik*; version **b** adds the translations of the *Asceticon* of Isaiah of Gaza, the *Dialogues* of Gregory the Great, an epistle of Isidore of Pelusium, the *Homilies on 1–2 Corinthians* and *Ephesians* of John Chrysostom, the *Homily on the Trinity* by Didymus the Blind, homilies by Basil the Great and Pseudo–Eusebius, the *Parable of the Snake* attributed to

17 The structure of C is laid out in Feder, *Kniazhiu...*, Vol. 1, 16–18.

18 The only independent excerpt from A is units 114–115 (see Mushinskaia, *Izbornik...*, Vol. 1, 218–219), all others are taken from B.

19 For version **a**, see B.M. Pudalov, 'Literaturnaia istoriia 1–oi ('Drevneishei') redaktsii Izmaragda,' *Drevniaia Rus', Voprosy medievistiki* 2000/2:76–95; for version **b**, B.M. Pudalov, 'K literaturnoi istorii sbornika Izmaragd: formirovanie 2–oi ('Osnovnoi') redaktsii. *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoi literatury* 58 (2004): 330–342. In neither paper does he question the assumption of V.A. Iakovlev, *K literaturnoi istorii drevnerusskikh sbornikov: Opyt issledovaniia Izmaragda*, (Odessa: np, 1893), that the compilations be assigned to 'Rus', 14th c.' A full-text collation of the versions in the Trinity–St Sergius Laura can be obtained by requesting the dossier 'Izmaragd' from <hilandar@osu.edu>.

20 For lack of an edition of A, I must refer to the edition of B.

Christopher of Alexandria, the *Quaestiones et responsiones* of Anastasius of Sinai, the *Pratum Spirituale* of John Moschus (and others to be identified), as well as the Slavonic *Izbornik of John the Sinner* and homilies by Clement of Ohrid and Peter the Monk. In some chapters, version **a** appears to have drawn upon **b**.²¹

Both versions differ from the compilations A–C²² in that they are synthetic: they do not merely excerpt gnomes from their sources and concatenate them, but use them to create new texts. The attribution of texts so created is, of course, arbitrary, e.g. in version **b**, ch. 36 is compiled from B 9:45 + unidentified + *Pandect* of Antiochus ch. 60 and attributed to ‘Basil the Great’; ch. 43 = *Quaestiones ad Antiochum* 92 + C 66–82 + B 3:30, 52 + unidentified → ‘Athanasius’; ch. 56 = unidentified + B 9:177–178, 180–183, 179, 178 → ‘Chrysostom’; ch. 93 = unidentified + B 1:58, 67–78, 80–81 → ‘Gennadius’; ch. 112 = *Quaestiones ad Antiochum* 113 → ‘Holy Fathers’; ch. 155 = unidentified + *Scete Patericon* L:18–19 + unidentified → ‘Chrysostom’.²³

E The Zlatoust

The *Zlatoust* is a compilation (up to ca. 75,000 words) ordered following the ecclesiastical year, drawing upon both versions of the *Izmaragd* (eight chapters from version **a** and twenty-eight from version **b**, eight entered twice on different dates), the *Kniazhii Izbornik* (two chapters), the *Izbornik of John the Sinner* (one chapter) as well as additional Slavonic sources.²⁴ It is known in four versions, **a** *Lenten* (sixty-five chapters, including the weekdays), **b** *Pentecostal* (**a** + Sundays from Easter to Trinity Sunday, up to seventy-seven chapters), **c** *Annual short* (**b**, excluding the weekdays in Lent + Sundays after Trinity, 117 chapters) and **d** *Annual long* (**b** + Sundays after Trinity, up to 147 chapters). It shares with the *Izmaragd* the synthetic approach to compiling new texts.

21 See W.R. Veder, ‘Gennadius Slavicus,’ in: *Srednovekovniiat chovek i negoviiat sviat*, (Veliko T”rnovo: Faber, 2014), 273–285.

22 Rare exceptions are in C the exhortation and the additions to the excerpt from the *Vita* of St. Niphon of Constantia.

23 This explains the ‘Gregory pope of Rome’ in the title of the exhortation in **i** as well as the ‘John Chrysostom’ in **z**.

24 See O.V. Tvorogov, ‘Opisaniie i klassifikatsiia spiskov sbornika Zlatoust,’ *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoi literatury* 39 (1985): 278–284 and O.V. Tvorogov and T.V. Chertoritskaia, ‘Zlatoust,’ in *Slovar’ knizhnikov i knizhnosti Drevnei Rusi*, Vyp. 2, ch. 1, (Leningrad: Nauka, 1988): 397–401. The authors assign the compilation to ‘Rus’, late 15th – early 16th c.’ A full-text collation of the versions in the Trinity–St Sergius Laura can be obtained by requesting the dossier ‘Zlatoust’ from <hilandar@osu.edu>.

The vast array of sources, some of them available to two or more compilers for months on end, suggests that the compilations were made in a well-appointed library. The precision of excerption and recompilation suggests that the compilers had intimate knowledge of their sources, a knowledge that casual reading cannot impart. Slavonic requires writing to gain full access to a text: these compilers surely had written many of their sources, if only their copies, draft or fair.

The Relation of Compilations A–E

Compilations A–D share an indeterminacy of purpose, save, of course, for providing edifying reading matter: any explanation for their creation is as good as the next. A decade ago, I thought that the extremely restricted diffusion of C could be the result of its being kept out of the public domain, but Dmitrii Bulanin in a thoughtful review pointed out that a dynastic destination ('for the education of the crown prince,' as I had argued) was unlikely in view of the high incidence of monastic compilations in the period.²⁵ He was right. The evidence of the D and E proves me wrong: both compilations had unrestricted access to C, so its limited dissemination is surely no more than accidental. Compilation E, in contrast, shows purpose by assigning texts of C and D (and other sources) to Sundays of the ecclesiastical year, obviously as readings complementary to Divine service. E's text versions appear to form the end-point of a protracted process of collectively creating new texts: like other texts of E, interpolation *v* shows the final touches of their dignification by circumlocution, and interpolation *iii* shows archaisation by reintroducing the imperative да въси → да въждь (inappropriate without deleting да).

That compilations A → B → C are related in one line of transmission has been noted in earlier studies. That this line can extend to E as well is proven by the evidence of the exhortation on reading, which shows that D → C → E must be recognised as another such line of transmission, both lines intersecting in C. The evidence of the exhortation also shows that a line D → B → E may have existed: in interpolation *iii* D's text could well be the source of B's²⁶ rather than the other way around; in any case, the B → E part of that line is attested in E's appropriation of B's chapters 3 and 4, respectively for the 29th and 8th Sunday after Trinity.

25 D.M. Bulanin, 'Izbornik 1076 goda i spory o natsional'nykh primetakh v drevneishikh slavianskikh perevodakh,' *Russkaia literatura* 2 (2012)2: 3–30. His critique, of course, entails that the dates I proposed for A–C, viz. 'ca. 900', 'ca. 930' and 'ca. 960' must be dismissed.

26 B and D need to be reread carefully over the entire length of their shared text to discover signs of directionality in transmission.

An Efflorescence of Compilations

The compilations A–E share excerpts with five others: 1. an excerpt version of the *Egyptian Patericon*³⁵ (a Greek conflation of the *Historia monachorum in Aegypto* and the *De gentibus Indiae et Bragmanibus* and *Historia Lausiaca* by Palladius of Helenopolis); 2. one or two excerpt versions of the *Scala Paradisi*, like 1. above, used in the compilation of 3. the *Scaliger Patericon*³⁶ (an excerpt version of the *Scete Patericon*³⁷); 4. the *Tikhanov Patericon* (an excerpt version of the *Scete Patericon* with additions from a host of other translations, among which the *Alphabeticum–Anonymous Patericon*³⁸); and 5. the *Zlatostruj* (a Slavonic compilation of excerpts from and full texts of translated Chrysostomian homilies³⁹). Their compilation technique is shared by another five: 6. the *Limonis* (an excerpt version of the *Pratum Spirituale* by John Moschus), 7. the *Svodnyj Paterik* (a conflation of excerpts from the *Paterika* mentioned with addition of edificatory narratives⁴⁰); 8. the *Merilo Pravednoe*⁴¹ (which contains an excerpt version of the translated *Pchela*⁴²); and 9–10. the *Prolog* (a compilation from the translated *Synaxarium* (a) extant in two versions, viz. b, the compilation of a with additional *vitae* and edifying texts, many of them hailing from the *Zlatostruj*, and c, the addition to a of edifying texts selected from b⁴³). These compilations form a corpus with a length of close to 400,000 words, i.e. more than fivefold that of texts composed in Slavonic in the ninth–tenth centuries, and it is by no means excluded that new identifications of compilations will add to it.

- 35 Ed. U.R. Feder, 'Paterik Egipetskij Kratkij, peredelka Egipetskogo Paterika do 1076 goda,' in Feder, *Hiliada...*, 195–210.
- 36 Ed. R. Nowak and W.R. Veder, *The Protopatericon Scaligeri*, (Nijmegen 1985) (= *Polata knjigopisnaja* 12), see also W.R. Veder, 'Elementary Compilation in Slavonic,' in Feder, *Hiliada...*, 110–119.
- 37 Ed. U.R. Feder, *Skitskii Paterik*, (Amsterdam 2012) (= *Pegasus Oost–Europese Studies* 14).
- 38 See U.R. Feder, 'Tikhanov Paterik,' in Feder, *Hiliada...*, 248–256.
- 39 See Ya. Miltenov, *Zlatostruj, starob"lgarski homiletichen svod, s"zdaten po iniciativa na b"lgarskii tsar Simeon. Tekstologicheskoe i izvorovedchesko izsledvane*. (Sofia: Avalon, 2013).
- 40 Study and partial ed. S. Nikolova, *Paterichnite razkazi v b"lgarskata srednovekovna literatura*. (Sofia: Bulgarskata akademiia na naukite, 1980).
- 41 Ed. M.N. Tikhomirov, *Merilo Pravednoe po rukopisi XIV veka* (Moskva: Izd. AN SSSR, 1961).
- 42 Ed. A.A. Pichkhadze et al., *Pchela. Drevnerusskii perevod, t. 1–2*. (Moskva: Rukopisnye pamiatniki Drevnei Rusi, 2008); see the review W.R. Veder, 'A Retrial for the Pchela,' *Polata knjigopisnaia* 38 (2010):145–154.
- 43 Ed. L.V. Prokopenko et al., *Slaviano–russkii Prolog po drevneishim spiskam: Sinaksar', Sentiaabr'–fevral', t. 1–2*. (Moskva: Azbukovnik, 2010–2011); see the review W.R. Veder, 'Markup in the Prolog,' *Polata knjigopisnaia* 39, [forthcoming].

The evidence of the transmission of the *Scete Patericon* indicates that a first copy (✚) of the protograph was made not long after it was brought to Pliska in 886 and left unbound for ease of copying: five copies of it are attested (α – δ), progressively muddling the order of the quires:⁴⁴ the *Scaliger Patericon* follows α , the *Tikhanov Patericon* follows δ , and both attest development, the first leaving selection entirely to chance, the second showing rudimentary discrimination. It is highly probable that both compilations were made by the men who had written the fair copies of α and δ , and it is just as probable that they were made even before the ninth century was over. The evidence of the transmission of the *Zlatostruj* indicates that its original, too, may have been left unbound for ease of copying; the transmission of the excerpts, in addition, shows that they may have existed as such separately from the homilies.⁴⁵

The evidence of the transmission of the sixteen compilations referred to above shows that they were all written in Glagolitic script (as were their sources), which precludes any of them postdating the beginning of the twelfth century.

As to the environment in which these compilations were made, I think we can trust the colophon of John the Sinner (at the end of compilation C), who says that he compiled his book ‘from the many books of the prince’. This points to a physical crossroads, which may well be the library of Prince Boris–Michael at Pliska and, after 893, that of Prince (later tsar) Simeon at Preslav. After 971, we must think of the library at Ohrid: the Greek *Synaxarium*, compiled after 992, was translated when the Preslav library had been removed to Kiev; version **b** of the *Prolog* reflects a variety of sources more limited than that of its predecessors.

Both the contacts between the individual compilations and the development of the compilation techniques suggest that the compilers must have been in contact with one another and mutually fertilised their endeavours. Compilation as an art form reaches a high point before 971 in the *Zlatostruj* and the homilies of John the Exarch, which freely compile selections purposefully translated from Greek homilies.⁴⁶

44 See W.R. Veder, *The Scete Patericon*, Amsterdam 2012 (= *Pegasus Oost–Europese Studies* 12), 34–35.

45 See Ya. Miltenov, ‘Obshtite pasazhi mezhdu kolekciiata Zlatostruj i Kniazheskii Izbornik,’ *Starob”lgarska literatura* 49–50 (2014): 28–45.

46 For John the Exarch, see M. Capaldo, ‘Jean l’Exarque en tant que compilateur et traducteur,’ *Polata knigopisnaia* 3 (1980): 69–89; id. ‘Art compilatoire et technique de traduction dans l’homélie de Jean le Prêtre sur le Baptême du Seigneur,’ *Polata knigopisnaia* 8 (1983): 2–14; id. ‘La source principale du Sermon sur la Nativité attribué à Jean l’Exarque,’ *Polata knigopisnaia* 9 (1984): 3–29.

In Lieu of a Conclusion

The compilations reviewed above are unquestionably no 'poor relations' to 'real' literature. They are so diverse and voluminous that it will take the efforts of many researchers with different interests to sort out their origins, interrelations and transformations, tasks which require great attention to detail. Such work will be as rewarding as the study of full translations and original compositions, if only because the transformations of the texts in the hands of successive compilers provide invaluable data as to the contemporary reception of their content and means of expression. At present, only the most pressing questions of general import can be asked: (1) Why do compilations assume a space which could be occupied by original Slavonic compositions? (2) Does their massive appearance in the ninth–eleventh century bear testimony only to active acquisition and digestion of texts, or does it have a bearing on their language as well? (3) Why are these compilations not discarded over time but transmitted well into the sixteenth–seventeenth centuries?