




Aneta Dimitrova (Sofia)

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1973-8462>

DOUBLE TRANSLATIONS AS A CHARACTERISTIC FEATURE OF THE OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC TRANSLATION OF JOHN CHRYSOSTOM'S COMMENTARIES ON ACTS

Introduction

The New Testament book *Acts of the Apostles*, although part of the Church life throughout Eastertide, was apparently “seldom preached upon”¹. John Chrysostom's series *Homiliae 55 in Acta apostolorum* (CPG 4426) is one of the very few extant commentaries on this New Testament book, and it is by far the most important among them. Chrysostom's homilies on *Acts* have come down to us in more than 100 complete or partial copies, according to *Pinakes*² – a testimony to their popularity in Byzantium. The homilies had an ancient Armenian version dating from 1077, apart from various epitomes and fragments in the catenae³, but it is unclear whether there existed an Armenian translation earlier than 1077⁴. Even though some commentators suggested that the 11th century translation

¹ Preface, [in:] *The Homilies of S. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, on the Acts of the Apostles, Translated, with Notes and Indices*, vol. II, trans. J. WALKER, J. SHEPPARD, ed. H. BROWNE, Oxford 1852 [= LFHCC, 35] (cetera: CHRYSOSTOM), p. V. In his study E.R. Smothers stresses on the importance of Chrysostom's work and points out that until the discovery and publication in 1921 of the Armenian version of Ephraem's Commentary, Chrysostom's was considered to be the first one of its kind, cf. E.R. SMOTHERS, *Le texte des homélies de saint Jean Chrysostome sur les Actes des Apôtres*, RSRe 27, 1937, p. 513.

² <http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/> [1 VIII 2019].

³ Some more information on the Armenian catenae see in: R.V. CHÉTANIAN, *La version arménienne ancienne des “Homélies sur les Actes des Apôtres” de Jean Chrysostome. Homélies I, II, VII, VIII*, Leuven 2004 [= CSCO.SA, 27–28], p. XX–XXXII. Rose V. CHÉTANIAN, the editor and translator of the Armenian versions of homilies 1, 2, 7, and 8, presents a rather fuzzy picture: *Other than many fragments in catenae, the original text is presented in two manuscripts, one of them containing a complete translation done in 1077 from the Greek (ibidem, p. VII)*. This translation was revised in the 12th–13th century, *ibidem*, p. XXXVIII–XL.

⁴ An undated Armenian translation is mentioned in CPG 4426. At the beginning of her survey, R.V. CHÉTANIAN states: *La question qui se pose est de savoir si ces épitomés ont été faits à partir des traditions arméniennes ou s'ils reproduisent des épitomés grecs qui existaient déjà; si tel est le cas, il*

replaced an earlier one that was lost, there is no firm evidence in this respect⁵. The currently available data do not support the assumption that other ancient translations of John Chrysostom's homilies on *Acts* existed before the 10th century, apart from an early Latin translation which is now lost⁶. Such being the case, the earliest preserved non-Greek version of these homilies is the Old Church Slavonic translation originating from the city of Preslav in the first quarter of the 10th century.

Chrysostom's *Commentaries on Acts* in the *Zlatostruy* Collection

The Old Church Slavonic translation of the Chrysostomian series is not complete and, unlike the 11th-century Armenian version⁷, it is not reliable as regards the Greek text. Not only is it selective and partial, but also it does not always correspond to the known Greek text. I will address some of these issues below.

At least 18 (out of 55) homilies on *Acts* were translated into Old Church Slavonic, namely the ethica of homilies 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 12, 18, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 34, 36, 44, 45 and fragments from homilies 37, 45 and 48. The translated texts were included in the renown *Chrysorrhoeas* collection (*Zlatostruy*) as individual homilies or as part of compilations⁸. Considering the fact that the circulation of these homilies in the medieval Slavonic world was closely entwined with *Zlatostruy*, some features of the entire collection are particularly relevant to our understanding of the individual texts on *Acts*:

1. The *Zlatostruy* collection is preserved only in late copies (mostly from 14th–15th century onwards). All of them attest to later stages of the text history with secondary changes such as revisions, omissions, additions, etc.

faudrait s'interroger sur la date à laquelle a été faite la traduction en arménien, sur le(s) traducteur(s), sur le lieu de traduction (ibidem, p. XXIII).

⁵ R.V. CHÉTANIAN calls it "une information difficilement vérifiable" and abstains from postulating a lost "Golden Age" translation, *ibidem*, p. XXXVIII–XXXIX.

⁶ Cf. E.R. SMOTHERS, *Le texte des homélies...*, p. 518, note 1. See e.g. the following definitive statement about Syriac: *There is no indication in the Syriac tradition that the Homilies on Acts were ever translated into Syriac* (J.W. CHILDERS, *Studies in the Syriac Versions of St. John Chrysostom's Homilies on the New Testament* (D.Phil. diss., University of Oxford 1996, <https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/td:602337526> [23 IV 2019]), p. 8, cf. also p. 6, note 25).

⁷ Cf. R.V. CHÉTANIAN, *La version...*, p. XVII: *la version arménienne des Homélies sur les 'Actes des Apôtres' apparaît comme un auxiliaire non dénué de prix. La connaissance de celle-ci est un outil indispensable pour l'établissement du texte grec.*

⁸ More on the Greek sources of *Zlatostruy*, its versions, its language, and other problems, see in: F.J. THOMSON, *Chrysostomica palaeoslavica. A Preliminary Study of the Sources of the Chrysorrhoeas (Zlatostruy) Collection*, Сър 6, 1982, p. 1–65; Я. МИЛТЕНОВ, *Златоструй: старобългарски хомилетичен свод, създаден по инициатива на българския цар Симеон. Текстологическо и извороведско изследване*, София 2013; А. ДИМИТРОВА, *Златоструята в преводаческата дейност на старобългарските книжовници*, София 2016.

2. There are several versions of *Zlatostruy*, most notably the *Longer* (L) and the *Shorter Zlatostruy* (S) with 138 and 81 homilies respectively. They have 62 homilies in common, L is more faithful to the Greek sources (and presumably to the initial translation), but S is preserved in the oldest copy – a 12th century manuscript from the Russian National Library in Saint Petersburg, F.n.I.46⁹.
3. The original translation was made in the first quarter of the 10th century in Preslav as a project initiated and supervised by the Bulgarian Tsar Symeon (893–927). Although no manuscript from this time-period has survived, the later copies are considered relatively reliable in respect of the original translation, especially the first 45 homilies of the longer version L¹⁰.
4. The homilies in the *Zlatostruy* collection were translated by more than one translator (and most probably by more than two) – the homilies differ in terms of principles of translation, usage of concurring means of expression, and vocabulary¹¹. We can cautiously suggest, that the Bulgarian compilers and translators selected the texts from numerous manuscripts containing John Chrysostom's works and divided them between each other.

In this context the *Commentaries on Acts* occupy an important place in *Zlatostruy*. With partial translations of 18 homilies – ethica and fragments – it is the best represented homiletical series in the Old Bulgarian collection (other Old Church Slavonic homilies selected from Chrysostom's commentaries include e.g. 17 homilies on the *First Epistle to Corinthians*, 10 homilies on the *Epistle to Romans*, 7 on the *Gospel of Matthew*, etc.). All but one of the translated homilies on *Acts* are included in L (four homilies in the first part L1–45, the others in the second part L46–137), and all of them are present in the other *Zlatostruy* versions (the longer L, the shorter S, the Hilandar version, and others). It allows us to make the safe assumption that these homilies were part of the original collection – the one translated and compiled in the early 10th century Preslav before the additions and revisions characteristic for the later stages of formation of the collection¹².

⁹ None of the manuscripts of L is edited, S has several editions, the earliest copy from the 12th century is edited in Т. ГЕОРГИЕВА, *Златоструй от XII век*, Силистра 2003.

¹⁰ There are many pieces of evidence to the time and place of the translation, the most compelling being the original preface, where Tsar Symeon is mentioned, cf. Я. МИЛТЕНОВ, *Златоструй...*, p. 7–12; А. ДИМИТРОВА, *Златоструят...*, p. 9–10. Some of the manuscripts with fewer scribal errors and deviations from Greek date from the 15th century and contain only the first 45 homilies of L, e.g. Russian Academy of Sciences, Saint Petersburg, MS No 33.2.12, Russian State History Museum, Moscow, collection of the Chudov monastery, MS No 214, and others. More on the manuscripts see in Я. МИЛТЕНОВ, *Златоструй...*, p. 21–28.

¹¹ А. ДИМИТРОВА, *Преводачески подходи в сборника Златоструй (Златоустовите коментари върху I Кор.)*, [in:] Кирило-Методиевски четения 2015. Юбилеен сборник, ed. А.-М. ТОТОМАНОВА, Д. АТАНАСОВА, София 2015, p. 18–32.

¹² This complicated issue is well clarified in Я. МИЛТЕНОВ, *Златоструй: старобългарски хомилетичен свод...*, p. 73–82.

On the other hand, the Slavonic translation of the *Commentaries on Acts* differs from the other homilies in *Zlatostruy*. There are many discrepancies between the Slavonic texts and their Greek counterparts, explanatory and expanded renditions of some phrases and passages are very common, and in some cases, the abridgements and transformations are so big that the Greek source is unrecognisable. There are two possible explanations of this incongruity: 1. the medieval Bulgarian translators had at their disposal a manuscript with a very different Greek recension of Chrysostom's homilies on *Acts* that did not coincide with either the "rough" or the "smooth" recensions we know today¹³; 2. all the selected homilies on *Acts* had only one Slavonic translator (or perhaps two – a "radical" and a more "conservative" one), and the discrepancies come down to the translator's free approach to the original. The evidence is not convincing enough to support either of these explanations, but one specific type of deviations of the Slavonic translation from the Greek source is particularly interesting – the double translations.

Double translations

The term "double translation" (doublet, Doppelübersetzung) denotes the technique where *one* word from the source text is rendered with *two* words in the translation. It allows keeping the equivalence between the source and the target language both in terms of form and sense, hence it is considered a method of literal translation¹⁴. The researchers give two main explanations of the phenomenon – when marginal notes and glosses were incorporated into the main text, or when the translator used two words for emphasis and clarity. The double translations are a widely used method across various time-periods and languages – there are examples in the Septuagint, in medieval translations, in the oriental traditions, as well as in translations into modern languages¹⁵. In the medieval Slavonic literature

¹³ Despite all the differences, at least half of the Slavonic homilies follow accurately the Greek source and they almost always stand closer to the so-called "rough" recension, cf. А. ДИМИТРОВА, *Гръцките версии на Златоустовите коментари върху Посланието на ап. Павел до Тим и Деяния на апостолите в сборника „Златоструй“*, Pbg 40, 3, 2016, p. 29–42.

¹⁴ The theoretical basis of the double translations in Old Church Slavonic is best explained in several works of E. Hansack, e.g. E. HANSACK, *Zum Übersetzungsstil des Exarchen Johannes*, WS 24, 1, 1979, p. 121–171; IDEM, *Die theoretischen Grundlagen des Übersetzungsstils des Exarchen Johannes*, WS 26, 1, 1981, p. 15–36; IDEM, *Zur Technik der Doppelübersetzung. Zwei Beiträge aus slavistischer Sicht: 1. Die Praefatio Brixiana. 2. Notker der Deutsche*, AnzSP 18, 1987, p. 79–127. An outline of the medieval understanding of identity between sense and form in translation, with an extensive bibliographical apparatus, is available in: F.J. THOMSON, 'Sensus' or 'Proprietas Verborum'. *Mediaeval Theories of Translation as Exemplified by Translations from Greek into Latin and Slavonic*, [in:] *Symposium Methodianum. Beiträge der Internationalen Tagung in Regensburg (17. bis 24. April 1985) zum Gedenken an den 1100. Todestag des hl. Method*, ed. K. TROST, E. VÖLKL, E. WEDEL, Neuried 1988, p. 675–691.

¹⁵ From Hebrew into Greek: J. COOK, *The Septuagint of Proverbs. Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs?*, Leiden–New York–Köln 1997 [= VT.S., 69], p. 13–16; W.E. GLENNY, *Hebrew Misreadings or Free*

the most prominent author and translator known for his extensive use of double translations is John the Exarch. This linguistic device is so typical of his work that it helped identify and ascribe the anonymous translation of Chrysostom's *Vita* to John the Exarch himself or someone from his circle in the first decades of the 10th century¹⁶. However, double translations are not unique to this particular author from the Preslav literary school. They are present in other Slavonic translations as well, e.g. in the so-called *Nomokanon* of Methodius from the 9th century, in the translation from Latin of the Gospel commentaries of Pope Gregory the Great in the 10th–11th century, and in the monk Isaiah's translation of pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita in the 14th century, to name a few¹⁷.

The *Zlatostruy* collection also belongs to this group of texts. The homilies are not linguistically uniform and they reveal varying styles of multiple translators, but most translations can be defined as free yet relatively accurate. As pointed out above, Greek words and phrases often have descriptive and explanatory Slavonic renderings, and double translations are only part of the verbal inequivalence in the collection. Six out of the 18 homilies on *Acts* included in the collection are not

Translation in the Septuagint of Amos?, VT 57, 2007, p. 531–533; M. DHONT, *Double Translations in Old Greek Job*, [in:] *Die Septuaginta – Orte und Intentionen. 5. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 24.–27. Juli 2014*, ed. S. KREUZER, M. MEISER, M. SIGISMUND, Tübingen 2016 [= WUNT, 361], p. 475–490; M. VAN DER VORM-CROUGHS, *The Old Greek of Isaiah. An Analysis of its Pluses and Minuses* (Doctoral thesis, Leiden University 2010, <http://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/handle/1887/16135> [18 IV 2019]), p. 25–60, (a whole chapter of the dissertation is devoted to double translations with clear definitions and many examples from the Septuagint of Isaiah). From Greek into Latin: J.E. MURDOCH, *Euclides graeco-latinus. A Hitherto Unknown Medieval Latin Translation of the 'Elements' Made Directly from the Greek*, HSCP 71, 1967, p. 297, note 81. From Arabic into Latin: S. DI VINCENZO, *Avicenna's Isagoge, Chap. I, 12, 'De Universalibus': Some Observations on the Latin Translation*, OrJPTSIS 40, 2012, p. 457–467. Additional literature is available also in: S. FAHL, D. FAHL, *Doppelübersetzungen und Paraphrasen in der kirchenslavischen Übersetzung des 'Corpus areopagiticum' durch den Mönchsgelehrten Isaija*, [in:] *Многоязычные переводы в Южнославянском средновековии. Доклады от международной конференции, София, 7–9 юли 2005 г.*, ed. Л. ТАЦЕВА, София 2006, p. 446, note 6.

¹⁶ In his earlier publications E. Hansack is explicit and unambiguous about the significance of the double translations, e.g.: *Das Vorhandensein von Doppelübersetzungen in der V[it]a Chr[ysostomi] [...] dürfte nach heutigen Kenntnissen als das sicherste Kriterium für eine Abstammung des Textes 'aus der Schule des Exarchen Johannes' zu bewerten sein*. E. HANSACK, *Die Vita des Johannes Chrysostomos des Georgios von Alexandrien in kirchenslavischer Übersetzung*, vol. II, Freiburg i. Br. 1980 [= MLSDV, 10.2], p. 24. For a more nuanced opinion in his later works with additional literature and commentary see: S. FAHL, D. FAHL, *Doppelübersetzungen und Paraphrasen...*, p. 446, note 5.

¹⁷ Cf. H. KEIPERT, *Doppelübersetzung und Figura etymologica im methodianischen 'Nomokanon'*, [in:] *Christianity among the Slavs. The Heritage of Saints Cyril and Methodius*, ed. E.G. FARRUGIA, Roma 1988 [= OCA, 231], p. 245–259; J. REINHART, *Une figure stylistique dans la traduction vieux-slave des "Homélies sur les Évangiles" de Grégoire le Grand en comparaison avec les textes scripturaires*, [in:] *Colloques internationaux du CNRS. Grégoire le Grand. Chantilly, Centre culturel Les Fontaines, 15–19 septembre 1982*, ed. J. FONTAINE, R. GILLET, S. PELLISTRANDI, Paris 1986, p. 597–606; S. FAHL, D. FAHL, *Doppelübersetzungen und Paraphrasen...*, p. 445–466.

suitable for a comparative study, because they deviate significantly from the available Greek texts either due to revisions or because of a different Greek original. Another two translations are fragmentary and are also not discussed here. In the remaining ten homilies, there are at least 90 instances of double translations (nouns, verbs, and adjectives only), some texts containing up to 24 examples. The examined homilies are the following¹⁸:

L12 Inc.: *Ге вѣдѣше не просто се избрании...* (MTA 43, ff. 100v–103v). *InAA hom. 34, PG, vol. LX, col. 250–252.*

L40 Inc.: *То дѣи ли богъ немощна...* (MTA 43, ff. 251v–254v). *InAA hom. 23, PG, vol. LX, col. 182–184.*

L41 Inc.: *Кѣде сѣтъ оубо жены ѿже всѣхъ ношѣ...* (MTA 43, ff. 254v–257r). *InAA hom. 26, PG, vol. LX, col. 202–204.*

L42 Inc.: *Нѣ да поманемъ и тѣхъ ношѣ...* (MTA 43, ff. 257r–258v). *InAA hom. 36, PG, vol. LX, col. 261–262.*

L86 Inc.: *Да не можѣте мѣнѣти кѣ намъ се тѣхъ всѣхъ бесѣдоуемо...* (MTA 43, ff. 448v–450v). *InAA hom. 44, PG, vol. LX, col. 312–314.*

L88 Inc.: *Вѣдѣше нѣ рекъша оубо негоже...* (MTA 43, ff. 452r–454r). *InAA hom. 45, PG, vol. LX, col. 317–319.*

L90 Inc.: *Не только во чловеци на благодарение оурижѣтъ сѣ...* (MTA 43, ff. 456v–459r). *InAA hom. 6, PG, vol. LX, col. 60–62.*

L102 Inc.: *Икоже во н сѣ христосомъ ѿдѣше и пнижѣ...* (MTA 43, ff. 490v–493r). *InAA hom. 1, PG, vol. LX, col. 22–26.*

L104 Inc.: *О великѣ днѣ...* (MTA 43, ff. 494r–497r). *InAA hom. 24, PG, vol. LX, col. 187–192.*

S22 Inc.: *Онѣхъ и мѣхъ подражани...* (F.п.І. 46, ff. 43v–46v). *InAA hom. 3, PG, vol. LX, col. 38–42.*

Although all the homilies attest to the use of double translations, the examples are unevenly distributed among them. Homily S22 has by far the most instances (24), followed by L41 (17 instances), L86 (12), L12 (11), L40 (7), L90 (7),

¹⁸ This list of homilies follows their attestation in the longer *Zlatostruy* (L). The earliest and most accessible complete copy of L1–137 – manuscript No 43 from the Moscow Theological Academy, 1474 (cetera: MTA 43), is available at <http://old.stsl.ru/manuscripts/medium.php?col=5&manuscript=043>. Homily S22 is present in the shorter *Zlatostruy* (S) and its earliest copy from Saint Petersburg's Public Library F.п.І. 46 (12th century) is edited in Т. ГЕОРГИЕВА, *Златоструй...*, p. 104–110. All examples are cited after these two manuscripts. The Greek sources are cited according to their edition in vol. LX of *Patrologia Graeca*.

L102 (5), L88 (4), L104 (2), L42 (1). Few of them seem to be of secondary origin such as later scribal revisions or integrated glosses, e.g. this sentence from L41 containing two pairs of double translations, *χαλκοτύπος* '(copper)smith'¹⁹ – *златарь и крѣвни*, and *σφῦρα* 'hammer' – *млатъ кладнѣо*: PG, vol. LX, col. 203 *ὁ χαλκοτύπος σφῦραν οὕτω βαρεῖαν καταφέρων* / *like the smith who lets fall such a heavy hammer*²⁰ – MTA 43, f. 256r *акы златарь и крѣ[м]вни. млатъ кладнѣо. толь тажько на рамо вѣзѣода*. In this phrase there are many variant readings between the manuscripts, e.g. instead of *златарь и крѣвни* (the mistake *крѣмни* is also widely spread) one Hilandar manuscript²¹ has only *крѣвни*, the 12th century copy of S – *коузньици*; instead of *кладнѣо*, there are variant readings *кладнѣтъ*, *кладнѣы*, even a correction to *кладѣа*, and S and the Hilandar manuscript have only *млатъ*. It is easy to suggest that the proto-Bulgarian word *крѣвни* needed a more common clarifying synonym (*златарь*), but it is more difficult to explain the asyndeton *млатъ кладнѣо* – *млатъ* is attested as early as Codex Suprasliensis, but *кладнѣо* is a rare and perhaps regional variant that may have joined the main text from the margins²².

Despite the fluctuation of some readings, most of the instances can be considered genuine, originating from the initial translation. In an attempt to prove this and to support the central proposition of this study – that double translations are a linguistic and stylistic device typical for the Slavonic translator of the homilies on *Acts* – I will examine in some detail nearly half of the examples. They constitute several types, although not all double translations can be easily ascribed to one of these groups.

1. Proper *Doppelübersetzungen*: one of the two translations renders the form (or etymology) and the other – the meaning of the Greek word.

Many examples meet this requirement perfectly, e.g.:

ἐκκλησία – L41 *црѣкы рекъше съборъ*, where *съборъ* 'assembly' is the etymological translation, and *црѣкы* 'church' conveys the usual meaning of *ἐκκλησία* in Christianity;

¹⁹ English meanings of the Greek words are mostly based on the definitions in *LSJ* and G.W.H. LAMPE, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford 1961.

²⁰ CHRYSOSTOM, vol. I, p. 379.

²¹ This manuscript, Hilandar 386, Serbian, 14th century, is a rare South Slavonic copy, considered a separate version of *Zlatostruy*, closer to S, cf. Кл. ИВАНОВА-КОНСТАНТИНОВА, *Неизвестна редакция на Златоструй в сръбски извод от XIII в.*, ЗИК 10, 1976, p. 89–107; Я. МИЛТЕНОВ, *Златоструй...*, p. 137–154.

²² In addition to this example from *Zlatostruy*, the word *кладнѣо* is attested also twice in the Old Testament (3Reg 6, 7 and Is 41, 7) and in Cosma's *Oratio contra Bogomilos*, cf. М. ТОТОМАНОВА-ПАНЕВА, *Книги Царства в славянската хронографска традиция*, София 2019 [= КМс, 27], p. 132.

(later in the same passage *ψυχή* is rendered with *оумѣ* at least two more times, the other double translation from this sentence – *μακρόθυμος* ‘long-suffering, patient’ *кротѣкъ ѡ трѣпѣливѣ* – is also repeated below).

The example from L41 is a repetition of the whole phrase:

PG, vol. LX, col. 202 Ταῦτα πάντα ἱκανά ἐστι διαναστήσαι ψυχὴν / *All this is enough to arouse the soul*²⁷ – MTA 43, f. 255r *н се довлѣѣ ти вѣзбодѣти дшѣ ѡ оумѣ оуставѣти* (*ψυχή* is rendered with *оумѣ* at least once more below).

The double rendition of *ψυχή* in L86 is adapted to the context:

PG, vol. LX, col. 313 τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εὐρυχωτέραν ποιεῖ τὴν ψυχὴν / *It makes the soul more spacious than the heaven*²⁸ – MTA 43, f. 450r *нбсе ширшюу творѣ дшѣ ѡ оутроуу* (followed by 2Cor 7, 2 *вѣстѣте се вѣ ма беве апѣлѣ*, where the idea of *κτροβα* as a vessel is contextually more appropriate).

I am not aware of another Slavonic work in which *ψυχή* is translated as *доуша ѡ оумѣ* and it is one of the characteristic features of the Slavonic translation of Chrysostom's homilies on *Acts*²⁹.

Although these examples are in perfect agreement with what E. Hansack refers to as “stylistic doublets”³⁰, the translator's pursuit of an accurate formal and semantic equivalence is not the only *raison d'être* of double translations. The Slavonic translation tends to explain and sometimes to adapt the Greek text to its audience and often does not adhere to the formal features of the original.

2. Complementary double translations: when the Greek word has a complex meaning or does not have a single Slavonic counterpart and the two translations complement one another.

Several examples belong to this type, e.g.:

σφοργιάω ‘to be vigorous, in full health and strength’ – L12 *юнѣ ѡ тоуѣнѣ вѣитѣ* ‘to be young and lush’, where neither of the Slavonic words is an exact match to the Greek verb, but together they convey the meaning well;

²⁷ CHRYSOSTOM, vol. I, p. 378.

²⁸ CHRYSOSTOM, vol. II, p. 600.

²⁹ Nevertheless, the Slavonic *оумѣ* for *ψυχή* is attested in some of the earliest manuscripts, such as Clozianus and Suprasliensis, cf. *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského*. (*Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae*), vol. I–LII, ed. J. KURZ et al., Praha 1958–1997 (s.v. *оумѣ*).

³⁰ *Entscheidend für das Verständnis und damit für die Wiedergabe der Mehrfachübersetzungen ist die Erkenntnis, daß es sich bei ihnen nicht um Synonyme im herkömmlichen Sinn (= semantisch leicht differenzierte Wörter) oder gar um Varianten handelt – so wurden sie bisher verstanden – sondern um stilistische ‘Dubletten’, deren jede in ihrem Stil (“wörtliche” oder “sinngemäße Übersetzung als Stil verstanden) genau dasselbe ausdrückt wie ihr Partner im anderen Stil*, E. HANSACK, *Zum Übersetzungsstil...*, p. 135.

προσκυνέω ‘fall down and worship’ – L88 **κλаниати сѧ н молити сѧ** with the same meaning;

παννυχίς ‘watching all night, vigil’ – L41 **вѣстаннѣ н молитѣ** ‘rising and prayer’ (in the same homily there is another – single – translation of **παννυχίς** as **обнощнѣ**, whereas in S22 the translation is descriptive – **нощню стражемъ бѧ молашмѣ**);

συναρίζομαι ‘come together’, literally ‘eat salt with’ – L102 **ѣсти н пити** (a reference to Act 1, 4, the Old Church Slavonic translation of *Acts* has only **ѣсти**).

This kind of double translations is indicative not of inaptitude, but rather of translator’s ingenuity. The careful wording of the Slavonic translation is evident in a passage about self-restraint in L12 (*InAA hom.* 34), where the words **φιλοσοφία** and **φιλόσοφος** are rendered several times with double translations. The question about the early Christian shift in the meaning of **φιλοσοφία** has been widely discussed in the past several decades³¹. A simplified outline of the meanings of this term in patristic literature, and in John Chrysostom in particular, can be presented as follows³²: pagan philosophy (negative, inferior) – philosophy as a system of beliefs and practices – Christian doctrine (viewed as superior) – Christian way of life – ascetic (monastic) way of life – self-restraint and control – martyrdom (endurance in suffering). In the *Zlatostruy* collection ‘philosophy’ and its derivatives are mentioned many times, both in pagan and in Christian context. Some of the most common Slavonic parallels are **мѡдрости**, **любомѡдрѣство**, **прѣмѡдростъ**, **мѡдростъ** (‘wisdom’, ‘love of wisdom’) and even the untranslated Greek word **φилосоφία** in L8, but also **вѣздѡрѣжаннѣ** (‘temperance’) in L13, L25, L27. The double translations in L12 are unique to this homily and are part of a larger variety of solutions, e.g.:

φιλοσοφία **крѣпостъ н сѣмислъ** ‘strength and reason’, **φιλόσοφος** **сѣмыслѣнъ нли вѣздѡрѣжѧ сѧ** ‘reasonable or self-restrained’, **крѣпѣкъ н вѣздѡрѣжѧ сѧ**

³¹ Here are some of the articles on this topic that were available to me, they provide a more extensive list of additional literature: G.J.M. BARTELINK, “Philosophie” et “philosophe” dans quelques œuvres de Jean Chrysostome, RAM 36, 1960, p. 486–492 (a continuation of G. Bardy’s previous research on this matter in the works of authors from Clement of Alexandria to Eusebius of Caesarea – G.J.M. BARTELINK is focused on Chrysostom’s works in volumes XLVIII–L of PG); A. GUILLAUMONT, [rec.:] Anne-Marie Malingrey. “Philosophia”. Étude d’un groupe de mots dans la littérature grecque, des présocratiques au IV^e siècle après J.-C. – RHR 164, 2, 1963, p. 244–246 (a review article on A.-M. MALINGREY’s doctoral thesis on the use of ‘philosophy’ from Pythagoras to John Chrysostom); J.L. QUANTIN, A propos de la traduction de ‘philosophia’ dans l’*Adversus oppugnatores vitae monasticae* de Saint Jean Chrysostome, RSR 61, 4, 1987, p. 187–197 (a reflection not only on the meaning of ‘philosophy’ in Chrysostom’s early work but also an emphasis on the ambiguous nature of the term – the author insists that this ambiguity should be preserved in translations).

³² Cf. G.J.M. BARTELINK, “Philosophie” et “philosophe”..., as well as G.W.H. LAMPE, *A Patristic Greek...* (s.v. **φιλοσοφία**).

‘strong and self-restrained’, κρῆπκκῷ ‘strong’, φιλοσοφῶν ἐν μικρῷ ἐντρονῇ ‘to control in temperance’.

The translator’s intent can be seen in the overall context:

InAA hom. 34 (PG, vol. LX, col. 250–251): καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄλογα φιλοσοφεῖν διδάσκουσιν, αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν τῶν ἀλόγων θηριωδίαν ἀνέχονται καταγόμενοι. Αἰνίγμα τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐστὶ. Καὶ ποῦ τὰ ἄλογα φιλόσοφα, φησὶν; Ἡ οὐ δοκεῖ σοι φιλοσοφίας εἶναι μεγάλης, ὅταν κύων δακνόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ λιμοῦ, μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν καὶ θηρεῦσαι, παρούσης ἀπέχεται τῆς τροφῆς, καὶ τράπεζαν ὀρῶν παρακεκλιμένην, καὶ τοῦ λιμοῦ κατεπείγοντος ἀναμένει τὸν δεσπότην; Αἰσχύνθητε ἑαυτοὺς· παιδεύσατε τὰς ὑμετέρας γαστέρας οὕτως εἶναι φιλοσόφους. Οὐκ ἔστιν ὑμῖν ἀπολογία. Ἀλόγῳ φύσει δυνηθεὶς ἐνθενεῖναι οὔτε φθεγγομένη οὔτε λογισμὸν ἐχούσῃ τοσαύτην φιλοσοφίαν, πολλῷ μᾶλλον δυνήσῃ σαυτῷ.

L12 (MTA 43, f. 101r-v): ннн скотѣ ҃ннѣтѣ. в' мѣроу етоѡше (v.l. етроѡше), а сани вѣ скотѣ ласкоуѣ дѣ в' падаюше. н боуѣнши его вываюше. бесѣда то естѣ тоуѣю речеши. Тѣ гдѣ скотѣ моужетѣ быти смыслѣнѣ. нѣн вѣзѣрѣжа сѡ то хѣда лн то крѣпостѣ естѣ н смыслѣтѣ. еѣа ѡсѣтѣ алѣнѣтѣ сы глаголю. н етража н емѣ заецѣ. то же гоуоуе пади не пастѣ. а вѣ оуѣтѣ дѣрѣжа. оуауе жѣтѣ гдѣна, да етрадѣте сѡ сани себѣ. наоуѣнѣтѣ есѡа урѣва. да вы боуѣоуѣтѣ така крѣпка, н вѣзѣрѣжауе сѡ. то како не бо нмѣте моуѣн ѡвѣѣмѣтѣ. да скотѣ моужетѣ наоуѣнѣтѣ н наказѣтѣ на все. а сани себѣ не моужетѣ наказѣтѣ. смыслѣнн еоуѣ по етѣннѣтѣ.

Trans.: (The masters starve their dogs so that they be quick on the prey)... and the brute creatures indeed they teach to be **temperate**, while they let themselves sink down into the gluttony of the brutes and are more unreasonable than them. The thing is a riddle. “And how can a beast be **reasonable or temperate**?” But is it a small **strength** [of will] **and reason**, when a dog gnawed with hunger and suffering, after having caught a hare, does not eat the ready meal before him, but holds it in his mouth and waits for his master? Be ashamed of yourselves: teach your bellies to be as **strong and temperate**. You have no excuse. You can instruct and teach everything to an irrational creature, and you cannot teach it to yourselves, who are truly reasonable?³³

In this episode ‘philosophical’ means ‘temperate, self-restrained’ (close to ‘ascetic’, one of the Christian meanings of the word), but also ‘reasonable, wise’ (σοφός) because of the opposition ἄλογος/λογικός, animal/human in this context. The Slavonic complementary double translation of φιλοσοφία as ‘strength and reason’ delivers the idea both of strong will and wisdom, and this is maintained further with φιλόσοφος as ‘reasonable or self-restrained’ and ‘strong and self-restrained’. The repetitive consistency of the translation, on the one hand, and its flexible variety, on the other, bear evidence to the fact that double translations are a deliberate and skilful linguistic device and a characteristic feature of the style of the translator.

³³ The English translation is based on CHRYSOSTOM, vol. II, p. 479, where the words in question are translated as ‘philosophy’, ‘philosophical’ etc. Here it is adapted to the Slavonic text.

3. Synonyms: the two words in the double translation are synonyms and convey the original meaning equally well.

The double translations in this group usually correspond to a single meaning of the Greek word, whereas the previous two types (proper and complementary double translations) cover at least two different meanings or nuances of a complex word. Usually, the Slavonic synonyms in these cases are not interchangeable, e.g. one of them could be a common word, and the other – an archaism or a dialectism, but sometimes it is difficult to explain why the translator chose to use two equal words instead of one. Some of the most typical examples are the following:

σιγή ‘silence’ – L41 **млъвання и шогвання**

The second Slavonic word with the same meaning ‘silence, quietness’ is very rare, but not unique, cf. the verb **шогвати**, also in a double translation of another Greek word in this homily:

ήσυχία ‘silence’ – L41, MTA 43, f. 254v **како ти все шогъи бестъ паница**³⁴.

There is another double translation of the same Greek word:

ήσυχία – L90, MTA 43, f. 457v **в немже велико млъваніе естъ и тишо все**.

It seems that the idea of ‘silence’ attracts the use of synonyms, although one word would have been enough, cf.:

σιγάω ‘keep quiet’ – S22 **млъвати и не бесѣдовати ннѣсже**.

σκυθρωπός ‘sad, gloomy’ is translated in L86 as **драхлъ и скръбньнъ** (perhaps the two words differ stylistically, although both are widely used in many Slavonic works in various genres).

The next examples show no obvious stratification between the synonyms, cf.:

θρήνος (θρήνων) ‘lament, dirge’ – L41 **слъзньнън (и) плауьньнън**;

πενία ‘poverty’ – L40 **оубожьство и нищета**;

καταφρονέω ‘look down upon, despise’ – L90 **прѣвндѣти и невѣщи**.

³⁴ The words **шогвання** ‘silence’ and **шогвати** ‘be quiet’ are rare, I. SREZNEVSKIJ gives only one more example from a 16th century manuscript, cf. И. СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ, *Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка по письменным памятникам*, vol. I–III, Санкт-Петербург 1893–1912 (s.v. **шогвання**). Usually **шогкъ** means the opposite – ‘noise’. There is an interesting parallel with a similar double translation in the 14th-century translation of *Corpus Areopagiticum* by the monk Isaiah: **ἀψόφως** – **безъ шогка и непаница**, cf. S. FAHL, D. FAHL, *Doppelübersetzungen und Paraphrasen...*, p. 451.

The use of synonyms as double translations adds to the stylistic and lexical richness of the Slavonic texts, but it may also point to hesitation and indecisiveness in the process of translating.

4. Contextual synonyms: the two Slavonic translations are an unlikely pair outside the context, but are a good match for the particular Greek text.

It is a matter of discussion whether some of the examples belong here, but this is an apprehension applicable to most classifications. Some instances provide an interesting insight into the translator's work, where word choice is aimed at the Slavonic audience as much as it conveys the meaning of the Greek source.

In L41 στενωπός 'narrow passage, alley' is rendered as стѣгна и дворѣ 'street and yard' and this translation is used twice in the homily:

PG, vol. LX, col. 204 Ἐκεῖνοι δι' ἀνθρώπινον νόμον περιῖασιν ἐν κρυμῷ βοῶντες μεγάλα, καὶ διὰ τῶν στενωπῶν βαδίζοντες / [The night-watchers], *by man's law, go their rounds in the cold, shouting loudly, and walking through lanes and alleys*³⁵, MTA43, f. 256v ТѢ БО УЛѢБСА ЗАКОНА Д'ЕЛА И БОДЖИИ. ХОДѢ ВСЮ НОЩЬ ТРѢПЕШОУЩЕ ЗИМОЮ. И ВЪПЇЮЩЕ ВЕЛ'ИИ СКВОЗ'Е СТЕГНЫ ХОДАЩЕ. И БЛЮДОУЩЕ ДВОРЫ (the whole phrase διὰ τῶν στενωπῶν βαδίζοντες is repeated);

PG, vol. LX, col. 202 Ἄν διακύψης εἰς τὸν στενωπὸν, οὐκ ἀκούσῃ οὐδὲ φωνῆς· ἂν ἴδῃς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, πάντας ὅσαι καθάπερ ἐν τάφῳ κειμένους / *If thou (look out of window and) lean over into the street, thou wilt not hear even a sound; if thou look into the house, thou wilt see all lying as it were in a tomb*³⁶, MTA43, f. 256v аще во сннхнешн на стегны <с> полаты то не слышнши гл҃са, нї нного ннѣтъ. аще ли сннхнешн въ дворѣ сѣи с полаты. то все виднши акы въ гробѣ лежаще. Although the second example is not a double translation and дворѣ could be a mistake instead of the correct *дѣмѣ, I think it is no accident that the same words стѣгна and дворѣ are used in this context.

The next examples are less controversial: the word βασιλειον (τὰ βασίλεια) 'kingly dwelling, palace' is rendered in two different homilies with similar double translations – in L40 as полаты и влаете and in S22 as въ полаты кѣ владѣкамы. Both solutions are contextually appropriate and suggest a single translator. The closest counterpart of βασιλειον in the earliest Slavonic literature is полаты цѣсарѣ in Supr. 199, 2, no other double translation is attested³⁷.

³⁵ CHRYSOSTOM, vol. I, p. 380. It is interesting to point out, that the English translators also use a double translation here – 'lanes and alleys'.

³⁶ CHRYSOSTOM, vol. I, p. 378. In the English translation there is a note concerning the word στενωπός: *the lanes or alleys in the quarters formed by intersection of the broad streets, ibidem, note γ.*

³⁷ For further reference cf.: *Řecko-staroslověnský index. (Index verborum graeco-palaeoslovenicus)*, vol. I, ed. E. BLÁHOVÁ, Praha 2008 (s.v. βασίλειος).

Some of the other contextual synonyms are the following:

ἄλογον ‘speechless, without reason; animal’ – L12 **конь или скотъ ннѣ** ‘horse or another animal’ (the word means ‘horse’ in medieval and modern Greek, at least from 6th century onwards³⁸, and the Slavonic translator was apparently aware of it);

ξένος ‘foreign; guest’ – L88 **нищѣ и странѣнѣ** ‘destitute and foreign’ (it is clear that the translator adds some Christian nuances to the idea of hospitality – to welcome the stranger, who happens to be poor).

The last group of examples includes several related Greek words with consistent Slavonic double translations:

δόκιμος ‘trustworthy’ is rendered in S22 as **искоуѣньнѣ и славеньнѣ** ‘skilful and renowned’, and **ἀδόκιμος** ‘unsatisfactory, discredited’ – as **ненскоуѣньнѣ и неславеньнѣ**;

εὐδοκίμew ‘to be of good repute, to be distinguished in’ in L40 is **славеньнѣ и искоуѣньнѣ бѣти** (‘to be renowned and skilful’).

The two Slavonic notions of ‘fame’ and ‘skill’ are not synonyms outside the context. These examples could also fit in the first two groups of double translations. On the one hand, their combined meanings depict the complex semantical structure of the Greek word, i.e. they are complementary to each other (group 2), and on the other, the Slavonic word **славеньнѣ** is an etymological translation of the root **-δοκ-**, cf. **δόξα** ‘repute, glory’, whereas **(не)искоуѣньнѣ** is a standard parallel to the Greek **(ἀ)δόκιμος**³⁹ (group 1).

The classification of the double translations is not only an attempt to confine each example to a group – as it became apparent, some attributions can be disputed – but also to point out the variety in their structure and inner logic. The Old Church Slavonic translation of Chrysostom’s homilies on *Acts* is far from literal, sometimes it is pleonastic compared to the Greek source. Here the double translations are both a method to accurately convey the sense of the original and a stylistic device typical for the translator.

Consistency of translation and comparison with other Old Church Slavonic texts

E. Hansack considered the use of double translations a distinctive feature of the production of a single translator (John the Exarch) or a group of translators from his school. Evidence from other works reveals that this was a more broadly used,

³⁸ See e.g. E.A. SOPHOCLES, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100)*, Leipzig 1914 (s.v. ἄλογος).

³⁹ Cf. *Řecko-staroslověnský index...*, (s.v. ἀδόκιμος); *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského...* (s.v. искоуѣньнѣ).

but not ubiquitous linguistic method in all periods of Slavonic literacy⁴⁰. The presence of double translations may not be enough for identifying an anonymous translator, but it does distinguish certain (groups of) works as opposed to others. A more valid argument for identification is the consistency of translation, i.e. whether the translator uses the same combinations of doublets.

One of the best examples of multiple uses of the same double translation is the last instance cited above, where two different homilies (S22 and L40) have used three times the combination *нскоуѣньнъ н славенъ* for *δόκιμος* and its derivatives. The same homilies have another doublet in common (not identical, but of the same root): *τὰ βασιλεία* 'kingly dwelling, palace' *πολαѣнъ н влаетѣ* L40, *вѣнъ полаѣнъ кѣ владѣицѣ* S22. Some similarities can be traced also between S22, L41, and L90, e.g. the rendering of *ψυχή* as *доуша н оумъ* in all of them (and nowhere else) and the tendency to translate 'silence' using two words (*σιγή* and *ἡσυχία* in L41, *ἡσυχία* in L90, and *σιγάω* in S22 all have double translations, the examples are listed above). On the other hand, there are many variations, e.g. the doublets for 'silence' are not the same, *παννυχίς* has at least three different renderings in L41 and S22 (see above), and the interesting Greek verb *ἐξίστημι* 'drive s.o. out of his senses; *intr.* be out of o.s wits' is translated in L90 as *вѣзѣвѣстѣ н нѣтѣпнѣтѣ оума* (*ἐκστήσειεν ἄν τῶν κατὰ φύσιν φρενῶν*), and in S22 as *оумъ погубенѣтъ н напразенъ оужацаѣа ѿ* (*οἱ ἐξεστηκότες*). Variation does not necessarily mean independence of translations – sometimes there are as many as three different double translations of a Greek word in a single homily, cf. S22 *σκανδαλίζειν* 'cause to stumble, lead into sin', rendered as *прѣвѣрѣшиа тѣорѣтѣ н влзнь* 'offend and deceive', *зѣло срѣдѣцѣу ѿѣѣтъ н влзнь* 'there will be evil and deceit to the heart', and *поѣѣзѣиѣн н влзньѣиѣн ѿ* 'accusing and deceived' (*οἱ σκανδαλιζόμενοι*).

The conformity between the double translations in S22, L40, L41, and L90 is by no means a matter of coincidence. It supports the assumption that these homilies were translated by a single Bulgarian translator who tended to explain and expand on the Greek original. This conclusion results in another important issue. Homily S22 is not present in the longer *Zlatostruy* (L), and L90 is from the second part of L (L46–L137), which was added to the first 45 homilies at a later stage. If they were produced by the same translator as the homilies from the first part of L (L40 and L41 and possibly some others), it is beyond doubt that all of them were part of the original Old Bulgarian collection *Zlatostruy* from the early 10th century. This is a solid argument in favour of the unity between the first part of L, its second part, and the shorter *Zlatostruy* (S).

The comparison with the translations of John the Exarch also yealds some noteworthy results. E. Hansack gives more than 200 examples of doublets from

⁴⁰ See the literature in notes 16 and 17 above.

Exarch's translations of *Hexaemeron* (Š.), *De fide orthodoxa* (Ekth.), and *Vita Chrysostomi* (V.Ch.)⁴¹. Some of them are close to the examples from *Zlatostruy*:

ὕμνεϊν – Š. хвалити н славити⁴², L41 молити н хвалити;

λόγος – Š. съмѣслъ н слово⁴³, L12 оумъ н мѣслъ;

*ἀδυναμία – Ekth. немощь н лѣнность⁴⁴, ῥαθυμία – L102 лѣнность н слабость;

*δεικνύναι – Š. съказати н наоучати⁴⁵, ἐξηγεῖσθαι V.Ch. оуѣ съказати⁴⁶, ἐντίθημι – L12 наоучити н наказати;

ἐπιθυμεῖν – V.Ch. желати н хотѣти, жьлѣти хотѣ, жьлѣти н хотѣти⁴⁷, S22 желѣти н жьлѣти (ἐπιθυμία – желаннѣ сьновѣноѣ н жьлѣданнѣ);

πρόνοια – V.Ch. промѣслъ н строн, L40 промѣслъ н строн, L41 пьналь н трѣдѣ, cf. проноεῖν – V.Ch. пьши сѣ н стронити⁴⁸.

The similarities, although too general, do not exclude a possible connection or mutual influence between the two groups of texts, which originate from the same area, time-period, and literary circles. However, the few concurring instances are not sufficient for positive identification of the anonymous translator of the homilies in *Zlatostruy*.

J. Reinhart gives another perspective to the topic⁴⁹. In his research on hendiads as a stylistic device he finds ca. 30 parallels between the double renderings in the 10th–11th-century Slavonic translation from Latin of the homilies of Pope Gregory the Great (*Bes.*), and the Scripture (especially *Psalms* and *Proverbs*). He argues that some of the examples are direct stylistic and lexical borrowings, due to the exceptional influence of the Bible on medieval literature, although the phenomenon should not be overestimated⁵⁰. Few of them comply with the examples from the *Zlatostruy* collection, e.g.:

Bes. ad delectationem на радѣваннѣ н на слажѣша, cf. Ps 34, 9 *exsultare et delectari*, *Ps. Sin.* вѣзрадѣвати сѣ, насладѣти сѣ (LXX ἀγαλλιάσεται, τερφθήσεται), and Ps 67, 4 *epulari et exsultare et delectari*, *Ps. Sin.* вѣзвѣсѣлѣти сѣ, вѣзрадѣвати

⁴¹ E. HANSACK, *Zum Übersetzungsstil...*, p. 138–171. E. Hansack claims that the overall number of the verified instances is five-time more, but he includes also pronouns, conjunctions, and particles, as well as many examples from parts of the text without Greek Vorlage.

⁴² *Ibidem*, p. 139.

⁴³ *Ibidem*, p. 145.

⁴⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 153. The example is without Greek, E. Hansack reconstructs *ἀδυναμία.

⁴⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 154. The example is without Greek, E. Hansack reconstructs *δεικνύναι.

⁴⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 155.

⁴⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 157–158.

⁴⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 158, 162. The two variants from *Zlatostruy* are very suitable for their respective contexts.

⁴⁹ J. REINHART, *Une figure stylistique...*, p. 597–606.

⁵⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 602–603.

principles of literal translation and as a stylistic device aiming at synonymity and linguistic variety. On the one hand, they are a distinctive feature that defines the translator's style and sets one group of texts apart from other Old Church Slavonic translations. On the other hand, the use of double translations in many different texts makes them part of a large and complex network of medieval intertextuality.

Double translations in the Old Church Slavonic translation of Chrysostom's homilies on Acts (List)

- ἀγρός – хлѣбъць или село L41
 ἀδόκιμος – неискосънь и неславънь S22
 αἰτία – внигы нмѣти и отвѣщати S22
 ἀκίνδυνος – безъ бѣдъ и безъ казни да бѣ сѧ не боиати S22
 ἀκτίνες ἡλιακαί – свѣтосе слъньца сего и логъ S22
 ἀλγέω – жалити и болиати L86
 ἀλογηθέω (ἀλογηθεῖς) – оумлъвати и оуцрамити сѧ L88
 ἄλογον – конь или скотъ ннъ L12
 ἄμοιρος – поганъ не приимъ дара того L102
 ἀναπίπτω – обоумрѣти (и) отънемоуи L41
 ἀναπνέω – отъдъхнѣти и оустоудити сѧ L41
 ἀνιάτος – бѣда и болижь L86
 ἀνίσταμαι, ἀνακτάομαι – вѣстати, вѣзвѣсти сѧ и оукрѣпити сѧ самъ L104
 ἀπαζιώω – отмиетати и прѣбодѣти L88
 αὐθάδεια – велнуніе и прѣзърѣниіе (v.l. велнунаніе и прѣзъръ) L41
 βασιλείος (βασιλεία) – полатъ и властеле L40 / въ полатъ къ владѣкамъ S22
 βλασφημέω – нмѣна кыдати и хоуанити S22
 δάκνω – срьдъца досади и прѣзърѣниіе сътворити S22 / cf. descriptive (δάκνομαι)
 како ми досажетъ срьдъца болижь L102
 δεινὰ πάσχω – велнко люто приѣти и въ велнкъ бѣдъ въпасти L104
 διαλέγομαι – оуыити и бесѣдовати L86
 διανίστημι – вѣзводити и вѣставити L41
 δόκιμος – искосънь и славънь S22
 ἐκκλησία – цркы рекъше съборъ L41
 ἐντίθημι – наоуыити и наказыати L12
 ἐξίστημι – вѣзвѣстити и испѣити (оума) L90 / (οἱ ἐξεστηκότες) оумъ погубивъи
 и напрасно оужасѧ сѧ S22
 ἐπιθυμέω – желѣти и жадаати S22
 ἐπιθυμία – желаніе сановноіе и жаданіе S22
 ἐπιμέλεια – потроужденіе и прѣлежаніе L12
 ἐπιτάττω – велѣти и стронити S22
 εὐδοκιμέω – славънь и искосънь бѣити L40

- ἡδονή – сласть и радость L86
 ἦθος – нравъ и обычан S22
 ἡσυχία – како ти въсе шогънѣтъ бесъ плнща L41 / велико млыванне ѣстъ и тнхо въсе L90
 θρήνος (θρήνων) – слъзыныи плавыныи L41
 καθарός – безъ зазора и чнстъ L86
 καλός – добръ и сладъкъ S22
 καταπίπτω – оустъпати и оубывати L86
 καταφρονέω – прѣвѣдѣти и неврѣши L90
 κατηγορέω – на ны глаголати и осуждати L12
 каторθόω (οἱ каторθοῦντες) – добрыи и прѣмыи L40
 κραυγή – клнхъ (v.l. плнщъ) и мѣтежъ L90
 κρίσις – зазхратн и сжднѣти S22
 λόγος – оумъ и мысль L12
 λύω – съказати и раздѣшнѣти L40
 μακρόθυμος – кротъкъ и трѣпѣливъ L90
 νόμος – оуставъ и строн / законъ и строн L12
 ξένος – нищъ и страннъ L88
 παννυχίς – въстанне и молнтва L41 / нощнѣ стражеитъ бога молаше S22
 παραινέω – оуветн и поощати на добро L86
 πενθέω – жалнѣти и плакати сѧ L86
 πενία – оубожество и нищета L40
 πρόνοια – печаль и трогдъ L41 / премысль и строн L40
 προσκυνέω – кланяти сѧ и молнѣти сѧ L88
 προστασία – строенне и попененне члвчнхъ S22
 ῥαθυμία – лѣнность и слабость L102
 σήλω (ἐν οἴκῳ πεπονηκότι, v.l. σεσηπότι)– оутѣль и гннлъ L102
 σιγάω – млывати и не бесѣдовати ннѣсоже S22
 σιγή – млыванне и шогънне L41
 σκανδαλιζειν – прѣвѣрѣнѣ творнѣти и влзнь / зѣло срьдѣцоу бѣти и влзнь / (οἱ σκανδαλιζόμενοι) потѣзѣишѣн и влзньшѣн сѧ S22
 σκοπέω – съмотрѣти и влестн L12
 σκυθρωπός – драхлъ и скръбьнъ L86
 σπουδή – тѣшанне и врьтѣнне S22
 στενωπός – стѣгна и дворъ L41
 συναλίζομαι – ѣсти и пнѣти L102
 σφριγάω – юнъ и тогънъ бѣти L12
 σφῦρα – млатъ кладнѣо L41
 σχίζω – раздѣрати сѧ и раздѣлнѣти L86
 σωφρονίζομαι – въстѣгнѣти сѧ и наказати сѧ L90
 τέρπω – краснѣти и глоснѣти L12
 τιμωρία – казнъ и мжка S22

τραχύς – бѣистръѣ н тѣжѣкъ S22
 τρυφηλός – пнрѣ тѣорѣ н пнтѣѣ L41
 ὕβρις – ховѣнѣ н нѣдѣбрѣ S22
 ὑμνέω – молнѣ н хвалнѣ L41
 φαῦλος – слабѣ нлн сквернѣ L40
 φιλόανθρωπος – ѡловѣколюбѣцѣ н мнлостнѣ L42
 φίλος – лювнѣ н дрѡгѣ L102
 φιλοσοφία – крѣпостѣ н сѣмѣслѣ L12
 φιλόσοφος – сѣмѣслѣнѣ нлн вѣздѣрѣжѣ сѣ / крѣпѣ(кѣ) н вѣздѣрѣжѣ сѣ L12
 φοβερός – грѣдѣ н стрѣшнѣ L86
 χαλκοτύπος – златѣрѣ н крѣпѣнѣ L41
 ψυχή – дѡшѣ н ѡмѣ L41, S22 (*bis*), L90 / дѡшѣ н жѣрѣѣ L86

Bibliography

Primary Sources

The Homilies of S. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, on the Acts of the Apostles, Translated, with Notes and Indices, vol. I–II, trans. J. WALKER, J. SHEPPARD, ed. H. BROWNE, Oxford 1851–1852 [= A Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church. Anterior to the Division of the East and West, 33; 35].

Secondary Literature

- BARTELINK G.J.M., “Philosophie” et “philosophe” dans quelques œuvres de Jean Chrysostome, “Revue d’ascétique et de mystique” 36, 1960, p. 486–492.
- CHÉTANIAN R.V., *La version arménienne ancienne des “Homélies sur les Actes des Apôtres” de Jean Chrysostome. Homélies I, II, VII, VIII*, Leuven 2004 [= *Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientaliū. Scriptores Armeniaci*, 27–28].
- CHILDERS J.W., *Studies in the Syriac Versions of St. John Chrysostom’s Homilies on the New Testament* (D.Phil. diss., University of Oxford 1996, <https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/td:602337526> [23 IV 2019]).
- COOK J., *The Septuagint of Proverbs. Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs?*, Leiden–New York–Köln 1997 [= *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum*, 69].
- DHONT M., *Double Translations in Old Greek Job*, [in:] *Die Septuaginta – Orte und Intentionen. 5. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 24.–27. Juli 2014*, ed. S. KREUZER, M. MEISER, M. SIGISMUND, Tübingen 2016 [= *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*, 361], p. 475–490.
- DI VINCENZO S., *Avicenna’s Isagoge, Chap. I, 12, ‘De Universalibus’: Some Observations on the Latin Translation*, “Oriens. Journal of Philosophy, Theology and Science in Islamic Societies” 40, 2012, p. 437–476.
- DIMITROVA A., *Grăckite versii na Zlatoustovite komentari vărhu Poslanieto na ap. Pavel do Tit i Dejanija na apostolite v sbornika „Zlatostruj”*, “Palaeobulgarica / Старобългаристика” 40, 3, 2016, p. 29–42.

- DIMITROVA A., *Prevodačeski podhodi v sbornika Zlatostruj* (Zlatoustovite komentari vārhu 1Kor.), [in:] *Kirilo-Metodievski četenija 2015. Jubileen sbornik*, ed. A.-M. TOTOMANOVA, D. ATANASOVA, Sofija 2015, p. 18–32.
- DIMITROVA A., *Zlatostrujat v prevodačeskata dejnost na starobālgarskite knižovnici*, Sofija 2016.
- FAHL S., FAHL D., *Doppelübersetzungen und Paraphrasen in der kirchenslavischen Übersetzung des 'Corpus areopagiticum' durch den Mönchsgelehrten Isaija*, [in:] *Mnogokratnite prevodi v Južno-slavjanskoto srednovekovie. Dokladi ot meždunarodnata konferencija*, Sofija, 7–9 juli 2005 g., ed. L. TASEVA, Sofija 2006, p. 445–466.
- GEORGIEVA T., *Zlatostruj ot XII vek*, Silistra 2003.
- GLENNY W.E., *Hebrew Misreadings or Free Translation in the Septuagint of Amos?*, "Vetus Testamentum: Quarterly Published by the International Organization of Old Testament Scholars" 57, 2007, p. 524–547.
- GUILLAUMONT A., [rec.:] Anne-Marie Malingrey. "Philosophia". *Étude d'un groupe de mots dans la littérature grecque, des présocratiques au IV^e siècle après J.-C.*, "Revue de l'histoire des religions" 164, 2, 1963, p. 244–246.
- HANSACK E., *Die theoretischen Grundlagen des Übersetzungsstils des Exarchen Johannes*, "Die Welt der Slaven" 26, 1, 1981, p. 15–36.
- HANSACK E., *Die Vita des Johannes Chrysostomos des Georgios von Alexandrien in kirchenslavischer Übersetzung*, vol. II, Freiburg i. Br. 1980 [= *Monumenta Linguae Slavicae Dialecti Veteris*, 10.2].
- HANSACK E., *Zum Übersetzungsstil des Exarchen Johannes*, "Die Welt der Slaven" 24, 1, 1979, p. 121–171.
- HANSACK E., *Zur Technik der Doppelübersetzung. Zwei Beiträge aus slavistischer Sicht: 1. Die Praefatio Brixiana. 2. Notker der Deutsche*, "Anzeiger für slavische Philologie" 18, 1987, p. 79–127.
- IVANOVA-KONSTANTINOVA KL., *Neizvestna redakcija na Zlatostruja v srābski izvod ot XIII v.*, "Зборник историје књижевности. Одељење језика и књижевности" / "Zbornik istorije književnosti. Odeljenje jezika i književnosti" 10, 1976, p. 89–107.
- KEIPERT H., *Doppelübersetzung und Figura etymologica im methodianischen 'Nomokanon'*, [in:] *Christianity among the Slavs. The Heritage of Saints Cyril and Methodius*, ed. E.G. FARRUGIA, Roma 1988 [= *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 231], p. 245–259.
- LAMPE G.W.H., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford 1961.
- MILTENOV Ja., *Zlatostruj: starobālgarski homiletičen svod, sāzdaten po iniciativa na bālgarskija car Simeon. Tekstologičesko i izvorovedsko izsledvane*, Sofija 2013.
- MURDOCH J.E., *Euclides graeco-latinus. A Hitherto Unknown Medieval Latin Translation of the 'Elements' Made Directly from the Greek*, "Harvard Studies in Classical Philology" 71, 1967, p. 249–302.
- QUANTIN J.L., *A propos de la traduction de 'philosophia' dans l' 'Adversus oppugnatores vitae monasticae' de Saint Jean Chrysostome*, "Revue des sciences religieuses" 61, 4, 1987, p. 187–197.
- Řecko-staroslověnský index. (*Index verborum graeco-palaeoslovenicus*), vol. I, ed. E. BLÁHOVÁ, Praha 2008.
- REINHART J., *Une figure stylistique dans la traduction vieux-slave des "Homélies sur les Évangiles" de Grégoire le Grand en comparaison avec les textes scripturaires*, [in:] *Colloques internationaux du CNRS. Grégoire le Grand. Chantilly, Centre culturel Les Fontaines, 15–19 septembre 1982*, ed. J. FONTAINE, R. GILLET, S. PELLISTRANDI, Paris 1986, p. 597–606.
- Slovník jazyka staroslověnského. (Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae)*, vol. I–LII, ed. J. KURZ et al., Praha 1958–1997.

- SMOTHERS E.R., *Le texte des homélies de saint Jean Chrysostome sur les Actes des Apôtres*, "Recherches de science religieuse" 27, 1937, p. 513–548.
- SOPHOCLES E.A., *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100)*, Leipzig 1914.
- SREZNEVSKIJ I., *Materialy dlja slovarja drevnerusskogo jazyka po pis'mennym pamjatnikam*, vol. I–III, Sankt-Peterburg 1893–1912.
- THOMSON F.J., *Chrysostomica palaeoslavica. A Preliminary Study of the Sources of the Chrysorrhoeas (Zlatostruy) Collection*, "Cyrillomethodianum" 6, 1982, p. 1–65.
- THOMSON F.J., 'Sensus' or 'Proprietas Verborum'. *Mediaeval Theories of Translation as Exemplified by Translations from Greek into Latin and Slavonic*, [in:] *Symposium Methodianum. Beiträge der Internationalen Tagung in Regensburg (17. bis 24. April 1985) zum Gedenken an den 1100. Todestag des hl. Method*, ed. K. TROST, E. VÖLKL, E. WEDEL, Neuried 1988, p. 675–691.
- ТОТОМАНОВА-ПАНЕВА М., *Knigi Carstva v slavjanskata hronografska tradicija*, Sofija 2019 [= Кирило-Методиевски студии / Kirilo-Metodievski studii, 27].
- VORM-CROUGHS M. VAN DER, *The Old Greek of Isaiah. An Analysis of its Pluses and Minuses* (Doctoral thesis, Leiden University 2010, <http://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/handle/1887/16135> [18 IV 2019]).

Abstract. The Old Church Slavonic translation of John Chrysostom's commentaries on *Acts of the Apostles* (CPG 4426) is attested in 18 *ethica* and fragments included in the Old Bulgarian collection *Zlatostruy* from the early 10th-century Preslav. The Slavonic homilies have many peculiarities in common suggesting that they were translated together presumably by one translator. One of their common features is the frequent use of double translations (*Doppelübersetzungen*). In the article nearly half of the 90 examples in 10 homilies are examined and divided into four groups – proper double translations, complementary double translations, synonyms, and contextual synonyms. The study shows that in several cases the Slavonic translation is notably consistent and repetitive, but more often it aims at variety and clarity. The examples from the *Zlatostruy* homilies on *Acts* are compared to other Old Church Slavonic translations (e.g. to the works of John the Exarch and to other homilies from *Zlatostruy*), but the similarities are not sufficient for identifying the anonymous translator(s). The use of doublets in the examined texts is viewed both as a linguistic device for a faithful translation and as a stylistic feature typical for the translator of these homilies. However, this phenomenon is attested in many other medieval literary traditions, which makes the *Zlatostruy* homilies part of a larger textual tradition.

Keywords: double translations, John Chrysostom, Old Church Slavonic translations from Greek, *Zlatostruy*, homilies on *Acts*, Preslav literary school.

Aneta Dimitrova

Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski"
Department of Cyrillo-Methodian Studies
15 Tsar Osvoboditel Blvd.
1504 Sofia, Bulgaria
anetagd@uni-sofia.bg