



THE SLAVONIC LEGACY OF ATHANASIUS OF ALEXANDRIA

Pirinka PENKOVA (Kalundborg)

1. The theological concept of 'divine' versus 'not divine' in the early Old Church Slavonic translations

The theological lexicon emerging from the Cyrillo-Methodian liturgical translations was systematized in the early *Preslav Literary School* (c. 893–927)¹ by Constantine of Preslav (9th–10th c.)² and John the Exarch (9th–10th c.)³ for two purposes. The first was to shift focus from the conceptual apparatus of the Old Testament to the mild moral of the New Testament. The second was related to the doctrine of Athanasius of Alexandria (295–373) and the need for an introduction of *theological register* as a result of the implementation of *linguistic exegesis*. John the Exarch and Constantine of Preslav transferred the idea of *linguistic exegesis* (hereafter LE) from the early patristic authors to express the antonymy of 'transcendent, divine existence' versus 'natural, non-divine existence, limited in time and space' by developing theological doublets for each dimension or using alternating forms for aorist and imperfect (imperfect for the 'divine' versus aorist for the 'not-divine').

¹ The *Preslav Literary School* was the first literary school in medieval Bulgaria that produced original works and compilations by Constantine of Preslav, John the Exarch, Presbyter Gregorius, Presbyter Kosmas, Peter Černorizets, and others, as well as monuments such as the *Sava Gospel*, *Codex Suprasliensis*, the Old Church Slavonic protographs of King Symeon's *Izbornik* (Svetoslav's Copy), *Knjažij Izbornik*, *Zlatostruy*, George Synkellos' *Sextus Julius Africanus*, Methodius of Patara's *Chronicles* and Ps.-Caesarius' *Erotapokriseis*. The lexical influence of the East Bulgarian (predominantly Moesian) dialects on the manuscripts, compiled in Preslav by successors of Cyril and Methodius, is traditionally considered the main evidence for the Preslav origin of the extant copies. For background and detailed analysis of the Preslav revision of the Cyrillo-Methodian translation, see Slavova 1989, 15–129.

² For biography and bibliography, see Stojkova 2008, 240–245.

³ For biography and bibliography, see Slavova 2008, 243–246.

The next generation of Preslav translators assumed the theological formula of John Damascene (675–753) while attempting to introduce theological standardization and harmonization following their contemporary Byzantine practice. I claim that the shift from the theological concept of Athanasius to the concept of John Damascene was reflected in the two different trends in Preslav translations, usually designated as *idiomatic* and *literal*.

The present paper aims at offering a new interpretation of the Preslav dogmatic treatises and suggesting that theological concepts in the works of the Preslav writers can be employed in assessment of dubious authorship.

This paper is dependent upon following works:

- Constantine of Preslav's *Didactic Gospel* (working up *Twelve Sermons* by Cyril of Alexandria and *Homilies on the Gospel* by John Chrysostom, ed. Tihova 2012) and *Orationes contra Arianos* (translation of Athanasius of Alexandria, ed. Vaillant, 1954). An unsolved problem is the question of the Greek protograph of the Preslav translation. Vaillant's edition is based on manuscript 968 in the Pogodin Collection of the Leningrad State Library. The examples from the *Second Oration/Discourse* cited here are from a microfilm of the same manuscript number 968; the microfilm is currently in the possession of the Library of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences in Sofia. The Church Slavonic text of *Orationes contra Arianos* was published by Makarij in the 16th century, based on two manuscripts from the 15th and 16th centuries (numbers 20 and 180, respectively, in the Moscow Synod Library). Makarij's edition was republished in Weiher, Šmidt and Škurko 2007. The comparison between the *Second Oration* published in the latter (pp. 99cd–124ab) and the *Oration* on the microfilm convinced me that these two copies belong to a common protograph. The authenticity of *Third Oration* is a subject of a discussion (e.g. Meijering 1994). For recent assessment of the authenticity of *Forth Oration* see Vinzent 1996; acc. to Vinzent the *Forth Oration* is one Ps. Athanasius' apology against Asterius of Cappadocia, Eusebius of Caesarea, Marcellus of Ancyra and Photinus of Sirmium. The textual analysis of Constantine of Preslav's translations compared with Greek is complicated. Migne (1887: 111–526) published the Greek text of *Orationes contra Arianos* I–IV in *S. Athanasii Opp. I – Historica et Dogmatica*. Since Migne's edition, more critical editions of Athanasius's writings were published – see Metzger and Savvidis (1998–2000), although there are no comparative studies of the Greek and Slavonic manuscripts or parallel editions.

- John the Exarch's compilation entitled *Theology* (*Bogoslovie*/Nebesa, part of John Damascene's *Expositio fidei*) and the compilation *Hexaameron* (*Šestodnev*, based on Basil of Caesarea's *Homilies IX* in *Hexaameron*, Severian of Gabala's *In cosmogoniam orationes VI*, and others). The editions

of John the Exarch's *Theology* (Sadnik 1967–1983), and *Hexaemeron* (Aitzetmüller 1958–1971) include reliable Greek sources for comparison with the OCS texts.

With exception of *The Life of Anthony*, *Comments on the Psalms* and *Letter on the regulation of Paschal feasts*, the Reception of other Athanasius works in the Slavonic tradition has not been subject of investigation yet. Following of Athanasius (or Ps. Athanasius) works, retained in Old Church Slavonic⁴, has been considered with regard to the theological vocabulary: *The Life of Anthony*, *Letter on the regulation of Paschal feasts* (ed. Penkova, 2008), **Letter to Antioche concerning the Holy Spirit* (ed. Kuev, 1981), **Catechism on faith*, **Comments on the Psalms and on the Gospel of John*, *Homily on Annunciation*, *Homily on Palm Sunday*, *Paschal Homily*, *On Antipascha or St. Thomas Sunday*, *Two Ascension Homilies*, *Homily on the born blind* (comments on John 9.1–4), *Sermon On Christmas Eve* (22.12), *On the presentation of Christ to the temple*, *On Annunciation* (25.03), *On the Birth of John the Baptist* (24.6), *Homily re. God's commandments*, **Antifilatin compilation* (based on "First Letter to Serapion" and "On the incarnation"), *Questions and answers on the causes of evil temptations*, **Memory on the three martyrs Ananij, Azarij, Misail in the fiery furnace and the prophet Daniel* (17.12), **Eulogy on Apostle Andrew* (30.11). Almost none of the Slavonic homilies have been edited critically and the list is not certainly complete.

2. The Trinity doctrine of Athanasius (key notions and exegetical technique, connected with LE)

a) Athanasius' faith in the divinity of the Son means that the Son is fully and equally God of the same substance or being as the Father. He is the only begotten Son of the eternal Father acc. 1 Cor. 15.57. The Son as Logos is not created. After the Incarnation of the Word, the Son remained unchanged as Divine Substance, because any change would cause improvement or deterioration (e.g. *First Oration contra Arianos* 1.35).

In his "*Orationes contra Arianos*", Athanasius used different grammatical forms to signify the divinity of God's Son. The quotations of John 1.1–4 and John 1.14 became an exegetical function as touchstone texts in the writings of Athanasius (especially in *Second Oration contra Arianos*) with regard to the incarnation of God's Logos. Athanasius used imperfect for the divine Trinity and aorist for the physical creation of God or the deed of the temporarily incarnated Son. Aside from the grammatical variation, there is a lexical one

⁴ The author expresses his special acknowledgments to the staff of The Hilandar Research Library at the Ohio State University and the Monks of Hilandar Monastery for the use of the microfilms.

in Greek too, i.e., there are two different verbs used in the Greek text of John 1.1-4 for the divine and for the physical creation: „Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος ... πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο“³ (cf. touchstone texts in the Athanasius writings that refer to the divine being and the Gospel of John in Ernest 2004, 107, 154, 400). Yet, the development of special lexica for the divine dimension by Athanasius has not been implemented throughout his writings, it has not been necessary due to his tripartite rule: Athanasius vocabulary of spiritual exegesis is associated with such technical terms as σκοπός 'scope', πρόσωπον 'image, person', καιρός 'occasion, time', πράγμα 'matter, subject'. He applies this terms to each disputed text, e.g. in *Second Oration contra Arianos* "the text may say "he created" (ἐκτίσε), but given the person in question (in this case the Wisdom of God, remark by P. Penkova), it has to mean "he begot" (ἐγέννησε)" (quoted from Ernest 2004, 139). Athanasius used phonetical markers, explained by John of Damascus in the *Exposition of the Orthodox Faith (De Fide Orthodoxa)*: "the word ἀγέννητον with only one 'ν' signifies "uncreate" or "not having been made", while ἀγέννητον written with double 'ν' means "unbegotten". According to the first significance essence differs from essence: for one essence is uncreate, or ἀγέννητον with one 'ν', and another is create or γεννητή" (translated by Salmond, 1898, reprinted 1997, 8). The imperfect affirmed the eternal nature of the Son, who is only temporarily incarnated in the finite body of a man. Athanasius' faith in the divinity of the Son (Jesus Christ) means that the Son is fully and equally God of the same substance or being as the Father (ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων γέγονεν). He is the only begotten Son of the eternal Father acc. 1 Cor. 15.57. The Son as Logos is not created, God had no separate Word, Power, Wisdom and ὑπόστασις apart from the Son. After the Incarnation of the Word, the Son remained unchanged as Divine Substance, because any change would cause improvement or deterioration (e.g. *First Oration contra Arianos* 1.35). The Logos and the incarnated Son had revelatory, not analyzable meaning, but Christ was an object of the senses so His acts were described using the aorist.

Athanasius' comments to the Bibles shows an allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament as source of prophecies being realized in the New Testament.

b) For the Arians, the deification of Jesus is related to His purely human nature and His further ascent to God. For Athanasius, Deification is only a

³ Further details about the exegesis of John 1:4 in John Chrysostom and Theodore the Studite and the difference between ἐν, ἐγένετο in the New Testament, and ἐποίησε in Genesis are discussed by Thomson in his study of the *Eulogy of St. John the Divine*, which had been attributed to John the Exarch; see Thomson 1984, 134, 149.

story about the personal improvement of an earthly man on his Soul's path to God. Athanasius used the concept of Deification, interpreted in John 10:34 and Psalm 82:1, and Acts of the Apostle (2 Peter 1:4 and 2 Corinthians 3:17-18). While discussing the Deification in his *Homily of the Incarnation of God*, Athanasius states, "Αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐνὐθρώπισεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς θεοποιηθῶμεν (Migne 1884, 192 B "De incarnatione Verbi", 54). I expect, that in different Slavonic translations the discourse of Deification can be indicative of the use of the LE pattern. This hypothesis needs further investigations.

c) Athanasius accepted the Antinomianism of Apostle Paul and the doctrine of the Law as source of sin through the transgression (Gal. 3.19, Rom 5.20), "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight" (see www.antinomianism). The Judaic Mak. Mishna's claim, that "God desired to justify Israel, and therefore He gave him many laws and commandments" was offended by Athanasius, he referred to the true nature of sin as postulated in Rom. 3.20, 4.15, 7.7. Athanasius' comments to the Bibles shows an allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament as source of prophecies being realized in the New Testament.

The use of John 1.1-4 as model for the use of preterita by Athanasius raises the question of the theological use of this tense forms in the first Slavonic translation of the New Testament.

3. Traces of LE in the first liturgical translations

Athanasius of Alexandria expounds John 1.1 according to his doctrine, re. the God's Providence and οἰκονομία: вѣ началѣхъ вѣ слово, и слово вѣхъ вѣ роуѣ. н... вѣ вѣхъ слово, егда наволюшю оуѣ. слово само выстѣхъ чловѣкъ (Second Oration/ Discourse in manuscript 968, leaf 68). The relation between the semantic of imperfect for the divine existence (вѣ, вѣаше) and aorist for the humane being (выстѣхъ) in John 1.1-4 was attested in the first Old Church Slavonic (OCS) Gospel translation, there are only two examples for this use of preterita in the Greek original and its Slavonic parallel: John 1.1-4 and John 1.14. The beginning of the Glagolitic Gospel lectionary reads: in *Codex Assemani*: Некони вѣхъ слово... вѣхъ вѣхъ слово. се вѣхъ некони оуѣ нѣ [...] векиго ничисоме не вѣхистѣхъ еке выстѣхъ (Kurz 1955, 2), cf. in *Codex Zographensis*: Некони вѣаше слово [...] вѣхъ вѣаше слово се вѣхъ некони оуѣ нѣ векиго ничѣтоже не выстѣхъ (Jagić 1954, 136). Another indicative example of the theological use of imperfect and aorist only in the OCS Gospel is found in the *Codex Assemani*, John 17:5: прослави мѣ [...] славою, ѣже наръхъ. прѣжде даже не вѣхъ весь миръ оуѣ ти (Kurz 1955, 194), which is a translation of the Greek "δόξασόν με [...] παρὰ τῇ δόξει ἣ εἶχον πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι παρὰ σοί". In the Preslav-revised *Sava Gospel*, there are two variant readings, as John 17:5 is featured twice, in two translations: the *literal* one, 26a7-8 прѣжде выти велиюю лироу о

тѣмъ (Ščepkin 1903, 2), and the reading following the Glagolitic Gospels, 107a17-18 прѣжде даже не бысть животъ (Ščepkin 1903, 99).

The first Gospel translator, Constantine the Philosopher, made an exegetical effort on lexical level to etymologically connect the Slavonic term for baptism (кръстѣнии) and the term for resurrection (въскрѣсѣнии) with the name of Christ (кръс-, хръс-) and the word for cross (кръстъ), the root крьс- existed in Slavonic with the semantic 'health' (j.f. the Russian proverb „не быть емъ на кресу“, 'he will not survive'). The difference in Slavonic between the resurrection of Christ (въскрѣсѣнии, ἀνάστασις) and the raise from the dead of a humane (въстанѣнии, a loan translation of ἀνάστασις, and въскрѣшѣнии) demonstrates the existence of the opposition 'divine' vs. 'not divine' in the Gospel translation, yet the technique of word-by-word translation and the authority of the Holy Scripture did not allowed a large variety of Slavonic antonyms. The prefix въс- in the words for resurrection (въскрѣсѣнии) and accession (възнесѣнии) denoted levitation⁶, the OCS term for 'revive somebody' (поживити) is different from the life after the dead (породѣ).

The occurrence of the opposition *divine* versus *created*, *temporary* on lexical level is found in the earliest preserved translation of the prayer book, the Glagolitic *Euchologium Sinaiticum*, e.g. the opposition between the Holy Cross (кръстъ) versus the term of the cross as torture device (распѣтъ), or in the prayer by Basil of Caesarea (ed. Nachtigal 1942, 124–142): вѣтъи, 'earthly life' нескъщаѣ, 'transcendent being'; ѿжѣтъ оуѣтъ 'God' 'substance' плѣтъ 'substance from which a man is maid'; подѣлѣнии въплѣщѣнаго вѣра 'likeness of man in ref. to the incarnated God' овраѣтъ неистѣлъѣнииѣ 'image of immortality' (cf. Penkova 2008, 65, 185, 192, 212, 217, 314). The compiler of *Euchologium Sinaiticum* uses descriptive expressions for the baptism of a earthy man (въ водѣ погрѣжѣнии instead of крѣтити) or for resurrection (сѣтворити животъ на грѣва нескѣтити instead of въскрѣсити).

4. The exegetical inventions of the Preslav translators

4.1 The explicit use of praeterita as language tool for salvation

The translation method of John the Exarch and Konstantin of Preslav is usually designated as *idiomatic* (Hansak 1979: 121–171; Thomson 1991: 35–58). In my opinion, John the Exarch adopted the principle of free translation from Clement of Alexandria, who formulated "the criterion by which truth and heresy are distinguished": "those who follow heresies [...] [are] not looking

⁶ The picture of levitating Jesus in the icon of resurrection is a late theme in the West iconography, cf. Hoeps, Kölbl, Louis, 2003. The mosaics in Ravenas Arians church (5th–6th c.) show Jesus after the resurrection standing fast on the earth in the ark, Jesus body as earthy man is visible in the picture of Epiphany.

for the sense, but making use of the mere words [...] they attend to the names alone, while they alter the meanings"⁷. John the Exarch treats his principles of translation in *Prologue to Hexaemeron*. In this paper, I argue that the two Preslav authors have deliberately implemented LE either in compliance with or regardless of the available Greek sources.

In order to justify Athanasius' dogma, Constantine of Preslav and John the Exarch transferred the use of praeterita from Greek, following the practice of Athanasius and the first OCS translation of the Gospel of John. The LE pattern for use of praeterita is explicit in John the Exarch's *Eulogy of St. John the Divine*: 32b2 *иже ѿ ѿсѣ то еѣ а иже о тварѣ то емъ* (Ivanova-Mircheva, 1971, 167). John the Exarch explicitly expressed the necessity of using a specific past form for divinity (imperfect) or non-divinity (aorist) in connection with the recognition of the truly Orthodox faith by believers, while stating that on the Last Judgment Day the use of the right linguistic formula would separate the Arians and other misbelievers from the Orthodox people: 34a3–8 *Еѣ начало еѣ слово: по оутѣ оубо е днь сжди и гл҃ахъ еѣ и не еѣ. и несет сѧ еѣра шой. въпросъ вждетъ шбонаѣ т како еѣрока. рече а ѣ гл҃ахъ еѣ. а шѣ како. а онъ еѣща не еѣ. иже ѿ ѿсѣ то еѣ а иже о тварѣ то емъ* (Ivanova-Mircheva, 1971, 170).

Numerous scholars have noted the use of the perfect instead of the aorist in the works of John the Exarch; Dejanova (1970, 148–150) offers interesting examples of the perfect denoting "an event preceding the present event in the meaning of *all-time* process". The examples with perfect in the works of John the Exarch discuss God's Acts. The hypothesis of the theological specification of the perfect in John the Exarch's works needs further research.

4.2 The development of lexical doublets for each dimension

Athanasius exegetical technique on word- and sentence level opened the possibility for the correct semantic judgment by the reader acc. to the tripartite rule. Instead of Athanasius' implementation of the context criteria for understanding of time and person, Konstantin of Preslav and John the Exarch preferred to develop theological doublets for each dimension ('divine' or 'not-divine'). E.g. for οὐσία they created the Orthodox theological opposition *сѧхѣство*, 'transcendent existence' is opposed to *ѣстъство*, 'physical existence, limited in time and space', while in the logical opposition the concept *сѧхѣство* 'substance', is opposed to the sub concept *сѧхѣство*, а

⁷ Quote from Clement of Alexandria, *The Stromata*, VII, chapter 16, English translation of the New Advent; see <http://www.monachos.net/content/patristics/patristictexts/334-clement-stromata-link>.

'state or property of the existence of substance'⁸. *сѣмѣство, сѣтѣство* translated *φύσις* too, if it was a question of God's substance or transcendent existence, e.g. *Ѡко Ѣмѣнѣ не нзвѣнѣ, нѣ Отѣчѣ порождѣ естѣ сѣтѣствомѣ, Ѡ Тѣс мѣ ѣξωθεν, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῦ Πατρὸς εἶναι φύσει γέννημα* (Veillant, 116, 15-16, Migne 26, 68), *сѣтѣствѣнаѣ чѣда* for *τὰ φύσει τέκνα*.

The first set of the OCS neologisms might have been focused on the Word and Son as begotten of the Father in Heaven ineffably, inexplicably, incomprehensibly, and eternally. The word *порѣ* 'genesis' instead of *рождѣство*, 'birth' for the appearance of the Son is a special neologism for the Incarnation of the Word as Uncreated Son, which avoids the Arian statement that if the Son is born, then He is not pre-eternal. Translating Severian of Gabala's *Fourth Oration* in his *Šestodnev*, John the Exarch transmitted Severian's argumentation for simultaneous existence of "eternal genesis" and "birth" contrary to the Arians (Leskin 190a-190b, <http://philosophy1.narod.ru/www/html/iphras/li-brary/6day/html>).

An exponential example is the translation of *στολήν τοῦ Χριστοῦ* 'the garments of Christ' with *ризы* 'shirts' (in relation to Jesus on the cross), but with the abstract *красота* 'beauty' (in relation to Jesus body as God's Son in the Homily on Palm Sunday in manuscript HM.SMS.404, leaf 142b), and *прорѣкниѣ* 'garments' in HM.SMS.384, leaf 341r.

There are syntactic data about the use of Instrumental for the *divine* dimension versus the construction of the preposition *отѣ* plus Genitive for the *non-divine*. The syntactical level needs special investigation together with other data like the use of substantiva denoting movement vs. substantiva denoting rest.

4.3 The morphological level of LE

The originality of the two Preslav authors consists in the creation of exegetical expressions not only on word- and sentence level, as the case is in Athanasius writings, but also on morphological level, without support for these structures in Greek. On morphological level the divine dimension was marked through Alfa-privatives for the Trinity like *нѣи дрѣчѣнѣнѣ* versus *нѣнарѣчѣнѣ* for *ἄρετος*. In the *Euchologium Sinaiticum*, 56a11, God is called *нѣи дрѣчѣнѣнѣнѣ* in the "Prayer of Exorcism (Against Possession by Demons)" preceding the "Spell Against the Evil", both attributed to Basil of Caesarea. This segment in the *Euchologium* is an interpolation from other sources compared with the surrounding texts (Van Wijk, 1926, 272–273).

⁸ The theological doublets (not synonyms) are discussed in Penkova, 2012, 25–27.

While attempting to obey the strategy to seek another adjective for the super-celestial world than the physical world, the Preslav translators affirmed the transcendent nature of God, the Father and the Son, by the use of adjectiva with the negative prefix не-, such as in the adjective неи глаголанъ derived from the participle неизглаголанъ, неислѣдованъ from неислѣдованъ, versus неислѣженъ, неислѣженъ from неислѣженъ, неиспаданъ from неиспаданъ (jf. *Lexicon Linguae Palaeoslovenicae* 20, 1970, pp. 360, 361, 375). In Greek texts, only one form — ἄ- adjective — is attested for both the adjective and the participle; therefore, the Old Church Slavonic dictionaries list both forms as synonymous. However, I would consider both adjective and participle instances of LE.

In the homilies, attributed to Athanasius, I found an other derivational pattern, which is created with the suffix -ств- in the nomina, denoting transcend substance, such as вѣтъствъ from вѣтъ, ѣтъствъ from ѣтъ, божъствъ from божъ, тѣлъство from тѣло. Similar morphological model to mark the divine dimension can be found in the usage of secondary durative verbs like благоѣтъствокати (vs. благоѣтъстити), благодарствокати (vs. благодарити), благодѣтъствовати (vs. благодѣти), алагодѣтъствовати (vs. алагодѣстити) etc. The verbs of first conjugation (e-degree), denoting one definite movement, were not appropriate for the transcendent realm; the opposite durative verbs of second conjugation (i-degree), denoting indefinite movement, were used in gnomic discourse: дѣхъ ходити, до прѣстола вози доидити (Tihova, 2012, 165d9), житиѣ вѣносити (Tihova, 2012, 59613-14).

To the rhetorical devices belong the rear examples of verb-adjectival dissimulation like the form приѣтвѣныи быти made after the model δεκτικός < δεκτικός εἶναι, e.g. чловѣкомъ пакы приѣтвѣномъ бывшемъ Прѣмѣдрости, δεκτικῷ σωφίας γεγονότων.

The theological nuance between the name of God-Father ('The God') and God-Son (only 'God') could explain the appearance of иже, еже in the function of the Greek article in context, related to the Father: Да рекъти оуко что востанѣ или кланити Бога еже быти елиѣ От'цѣ прино сынови, free translation with Slavonic anastrophe from τί τὸ ἐμποδίζον τὸν Θεὸν, ἀεὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ Πατέρα αὐτὸν εἶναι (Vaillant, 1954, 116, 7). The common opinion for the use of иже, еже as an imitation of the Greek article is, that иже, еже belongs to the *literal* method of translation, jf. раждѣемое во еже быти отъ отца оуказано естъ, τὸ γὰρ ἐκ πατρὸς εἶναι τὸ γεννώμενον (Vaillant, 1954, 116, 7-8).

The compatibility of LE with the discourse of Deification (Theosis, *θεοποίησις*)

Athanasius' concept of Deification is based on Psalm 82:1, John 10:34 and Acts of Apostles, 2 Peter 1:4 and 2 Corinthians 3:17-18. In different manuscripts, the discourse of Deification can be indicative of the use of the LE pattern, because Constantine of Preslav and John the Exarch employed their register in connection with events related to the Spiritual Ladder as the elevation of the souls to God and the unity with the Holy Trinity through participation of God's divine energies. The word *θεοποίησις* is attested in *Theology (Bogoslovie)* on 248a1-2 (Sadnik 1981, 166). John the Exarch borrows the theme from Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* 7, Chapter 16, 101; Stählin 1960, 4), who writes: ὁ τῷ κυρίῳ πειθόμενος καὶ τῇ δοθείσῃ δι' αὐτοῦ κατακολουθήνας προφητεῖ τελέως ἐκτελεῖται κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ διδασκάλου ἐν σαρκὶ περιπολῶν θεός⁵. In *Hexameron*, in the chapter "Divine Construction and Our Advocacy and Salvation", 'a condescending movement (without loss of divinity) for achieving appeasement' is opposed to Deification (in the form of spiritual advent); the translation by John the Exarch and the second translation by the anonymous translator illustrate the different theological concepts. According to John the Exarch: *иже къ образъ ѣжи сѣ преклонъ спѣсѣ сѣниде се естъ непооужоженна елико кѣсостъ непооужоженъ пооужоженъ сѣнидѣтъ къ спонанъ раколъ*, and according to the second translator *прѣклонъ нѣсѣ нисходитъ сирѣчь нислѣри' на него кѣсостъ, нислѣри' нѣ сѣниде се сѣнисходитъ спонанъ раколъ*; Gr. ὁ ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων κλίνει οὐ ρανούς κατέρχεται. Τοῦτέστι τὸ ἀγαπείνωτον αὐτοῦ ὕψος ἀταπεινῶτως ταπεινῶσας συγκαταβαίνει τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ δούλοις (Sadnik 1983, 225a; Weiher 1987, 239b).

In the light of Athanasius' interpretation of the nature of Christ, it is easy to understand why John the Exarch does not translate chapter 62 about the Deification (cf. the *literal* translation: *ω τομιъ ѣже ѡпѣкити се ѣ еткого гѣ тѣлѣи, περί τοῦ τελεῶσθαι τὴν φύσιν τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου σαρκός* (Weiher 1987, 406). Due to the merger of physical and divine nature in God's body, following John Damascene, the theological register of John the Exarch cannot be used without a lot of additional comments or explanations to the Damascene's texts, e.g., in the *literal* translation: *по смотрител' нѣмъ сѣиди-мѣнино, ѣже по състапоу гѣлю... ѣоу сѣокоу сѣидити се. и ѣже къ дрогѣ дрогѣлиъ ѣетколиъ пролѣкити, κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομικὴν ἔνωσιν, τὴν καθ' ὑπόστασιν*

⁵ My translation reads: "he who trusts in the Lord and follows the prophecy given by him will be formed perfectly in the likeness of the teacher [made] a God who [i.e. the teacher] goes about in [transitory] flesh".

[...] τῷ Θεῷ Λόγῳ ἦνωται, καὶ τὴν ἐν ἀλλήλοις τῶν φύσεων περιχώρησιν (Weiher 1987, 406). One of the copies gives *вѣснѣчнѣи* instead of *вѣчнѣчнѣи*, possibly a trace of earlier Preslav translation concept.

1. LE and the language of the dubious homilies

If the OCS rules for LE were confirmed by the translation of Athanasius *Orationes* and generally accepted in the early Preslav school, then we can assume that the period between 916 and 927 can be the time of origin for anonymous translations with consequent use of LE. The deliberate remove of the neologisms, created by Constantine of Preslav and John the Exarch by the next generation of Preslav writers can be a marker for later origin of the text. E.g. the *Izbornik of 1073* does not distinguish between the use of *сочшѣи* and *исѣшѣи*, *сѣшѣи* and *лицѣ*. The translator explicitly strayed from different denominations for divine and non-divine existence: *Ма҃нагоу оу разничи сошшѣи и исѣшѣи по вѣрѣшннѣи [...]* Цр҃кѣвнѣи же оучителѣ не разничѣ намен снани вѣсѣдоуаша и то же сошшѣи и исѣшѣи нарекоша ко҃же и сѣшѣи лицѣ (Johannet 1991, 61–62).

This simplification of the theological vocabulary was partly supported by the Latin and Byzantine practices of the 10th century and based on the Christological position of John Damascene.

I will illustrate how the LE pattern in one anonymous Homily in “Zlatostruy” helps us to be more precise in our reconstructions of data. The archetype of Chrysostomian collection “Zlatostruy”, is preserved in two redactions from 12th–14th c. based on one longer and one shorter proto-collection; many branching and versions are not published. In “Zlatostruy”, published by Georgieva (Georgieva 2003, 191–198), the homily is titled *слово ѡ тварѣи бж҃ии. и ѡ коньчнѣи сѣшѣи*, earlier version discussed by Miltenov, titled *106v слово ѡ сѣшѣи троици, и ѡ тварѣи. и ѡ соудѣи бж҃ии* (Miltenov 2013, www.academia.edu/1016649/, 14). Miltenov resembles the recent research’s sum: the Chrysostomian corpus was gathered in the period 893–919, “Zlatostruy” was probably assembled in the period 919–927, The Greek parallel of this homily is unknown, the Slavonic text is a compilation of a Pseudo-Clementine homily and part of John Chrysostom’s Repentance Homily; the text is attributed commonly to John Chrysostom and only in one “abridged” version in one 15th c. Russian manuscript it is attributed to the Clement; many scholars have pointed out some thematic similarities between this homily and Clement of Ohrida’s works (Miltenov 2013, www.academia.edu/1016649/, 14–15).

It is well known, that Clement of Ohrida together with Constantine of Preslav and Naum translated the Greek liturgical menology and added their

own compositions in it (Stancev 1995, 331), probably in the period 886–889. Clement of Ohrida died in 916, the year of Constantine of Preslav's translation of Athanasius "Oratines contra Arianos".

The formula for the Son (Logos) in the published Clements homilies, proven to be Clementine, is: "ѡ ѿ бѣ и члвкъ соудѡуъ истѣстномъ (Angelov, Kuev, Kodov 1970, 131). In Constantine's *Didactic Gospel* the Son (Logos) and Christ are indivisible: тѣло хѣ ѡа нашего. тѣло истѣ живота и плѣтъ вѣселюушаго јединочадна. ѡна и слова бѣжна, сѡма... καὶ σὰρξ τοῦ πάντα ἰσχύοντος Λόγου.

The use of LE in the above mentioned homily could be traced back to the elevated model of Christianity, created by the Slavonic followers of Athanasius due to the following distinctive features:

a. regular use of *в стѣ* for the created world and *вѣши* for the transcend action: 116б видѣвъ же бѣ творѣ оукрашеноу. порелѣкниахъ си, члвкъ же не оу вѣши красующа сѧ юю. рече бѣ сътвориахъ члвка. рекъши ѡцѣ кѣ сѣноу. да владѣиетъ всѣмъ... и самовластие дастъ юмоу (Georgieva 2003, 192);

b. explicit lexical differentiation between divine and not-divine, e.g. *сѡвѣсто*, not *истѣсто* for the immaterial Trinity, *водъ прѣккъ шыа* ("celestial waters"), but *сѣставъ воды* ("sea"), *тѣрды нѣбо* for *στερεωμα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* ("the vault of heaven, firmament"), but *соуша, землкъ* ("dry land, mainland");

c. Christ the Word is interpreted primarily in terms of Father-Son relation, as in Athanasius "Orationes". E.g. the Son's presence with Father during the creation act: 115г—116а воиъ прѣмоудростию своєю вѣсю творѣ сътвори... рекъши ѡцѣ сѣмъ. томоу во рече сѧди ш десноу ю мени. (Georgieva 2003, 191–192), 116б рече бѣ сътвориахъ члвка. рекъши ѡцѣ кѣ сѣноу (Georgieva 2003, 192).

d. The topos "admonition on the Last Judgment" with the reference to the dogma confession, while stating that on the Last Judgment Day the use of the right formula would separate the misbelievers from the Orthodox people, is attested in John the Exarch (see 2.1) and in this homily: 117в вѣпросиши воудѣахъ... прѣвое же ш правѣи вѣрк. аще ю воудѣахъ доирѣ съвѣаши (Georgieva 2003, 195).

The close verbal correspondence of the two patches is important;

e. the topos "correlation between good deeds and right believe as path to salvation" is represented in this homily with quotations from Matthias Gospel, 25, 35–41. The ungracious enemies of the Church are mentioned among the unbelievers: 118 и сѧ члвкъ вѣроу люю ѡтнѣрже. сѧ люа апѣстолы ѡтнѣмъ. сѧ икѣ досадитѣ мѡси цркви, сѧ члвкъ вѣроу люю ѡтнѣрже, 118а идѣте ѡ мени немилостивни. немилостивни вратитѣ своѣа и хѣ немилостивни (Georgieva 2003, 196). Athanasius

refers to Matt. 25.35-40 in his second "*Oratio contra Arianos*" and in "*History of the Arians*" (Ernest 2004, 396) with stress on the Church enemies' works and the ill-treatment of the poor (See *History Arianorum ad Monachos* in www.documentacatolicaomnia.eu/03d/0295-0373, p. 292). A reference to the beginning of Matt. 25.35-41 as quotations, familiar to everybody, is cited in *Didactic Gospel*, in Constantin of Preslav's own comments: 10a 4-12 аще творять колю юго. алычюуама напитающе. и прочне. и ѿмать ны съподовити вѣчныхъхъ благу (Tihova, 2012, 29). Similar exposition of Matt. 25.35-41 in 143b поукъ алычюуама напитаѿи. и жадыныи напѿи. и прочне (Tihova, 2012, 285). Any charity gives wings to ones pray: 125d7-12 алычюуама ѿлю. та ко вѣпритъ и молитѿж (Tihova, 2012, 250).

e. the statistical data show the proximity of the vocabulary in this homily and in the works of Preslav school (T. Georgieva, 2005, 207-226).

Moving from the scope of exegesis, to the scope of language usage, I found the use of the Bulgarian definite article especially notable, because the article is observed in John the Exarchs *Hexameron* too (Mirchev, 1978, 201), e.g. 117a да порѣчатъ наикни то (Georgieva 2003, 194).

There are text parallels between Clements *Homily on the holy Trinity* and the Zlatostruj homily, but parallel topoi or use of the same lexica are not proof for authorship. The LE in the Zlatostruj homily is only an evidence, that the translator or compiler or the author of the compilation was not Clement, but a compiler, educated in the early Preslav school, more like after the translation of *Orationes* in 906 AD. In Clement of Ohrida's "Sermon on Annunciation" the Son of God (Logos) is described as соугоуѣ юстъствома ѿъ и члѣкъ (Angelov, Kuev, Kodov, 1970, 545), the same double nature is to find in "Sermon on Christmas" хъ, истинны ѿъ ишъ, соугоуѣ юстъствома (Angelov, Kuev, Kodov, 1970, 353). Here "the double nature" reflects a separate existence of Jesus along with the life of an individual¹⁰. I did not find the special terms сжръство и породъ in the copies of Clement writings, published in the Collection Климент Охридски, Събраните съчинения, т. 1. As the translation of ὑπόστασις in the *Homily on the holy Trinity* indicates, the language use of

¹⁰ In the beginning of *Hexameron* John the Exarch uses *In mundi creationem orationes VI* of Theodoretī Episcopi Cyrensis Greacarum affectionum curatio (ed. Thomas Gaisford, Oxford, 1836). He declines a "contracting into one" of the two natures of the only begotten. Theodorite's idea in *Cure of the Greek Maladies* is that the truth of the Gospel can be proved from Greek philosophy. Instead of a union according to hypostases, he would accept only one, that "manifests the essential properties or modes of the natures". Theodorite's Slavonic translator uses ишъ for φύσις, наикни for ὑπόστασις; наикни is a property of естъство (as сжръство is for сжръство).

Спространов, Опис на ръкописите в библиотеката при Рилския манастир, 4/5, София, 1902), in Rumania acc. to Mircea, 2005, 31: BAR 301, f. 405v, 302, f. 222r, 678, f. 290v, Dragomirna 1795, f. 374v, Putna 65, f. 120v, Iași BCU vi240, f. 37, PG 28, 944–957 (BHG, III, 174, 113\1161k); in Bibliotheca Hagiographica Balcano-Slavica (further BHBS, Ivanova, 2008, 379): УББ1/28, dated 1595, f. 126б–132б (on 20.12) Иисусъ Яѳанасіа... and Pl 42, *Clavis patrum graecorum* (CPG) 2269.

2. *Homily on Christmas Eve* (22.12) Hil 442, f. 522–526 *тогожде аѳанасіа... на рождѣствѣнь днь ꙗ и ѡа и спса нашего ѡ хѡ*, incip. *Начеа радости и веселіа дхоннаа трапеза хош поставити*; in НБКМ 300, 138б–143, *дхоннааго трапеза*, Rila 353б–356б. Acc. to Mircea BAR 301, f. 391r, 302, f. 262v, 358, f. 49r, 678, f. 338v, Dragomirna 1795, f. 421r, Putna 65, f. 161v, Iași BCU VI240, f. 81r, Arad Évêché 10, f. 17r; acc. to BHBS, c. 385: Зогр 107, 305в-308, НБКМ1045, 208б-210б, Пор 873, 61б-63б, Дпар. 706, 418-421, Рс 725, 296?-35?, Лавра Z52, 129б-132, Пл 42, 113–116, Зогр 109, 148б-153, Hil 442, 522–526, Hil 649, 257v–260v, Hil 489, 52-55, in МЧМ 2348–2353. Among the manuscripts, originated from the 14th c., are BAR 302 (1375–1400), Pogodin 873, 61б–63б (BHBS, 110–111, 385) and Zogr 107 (BHBS, 74, 385). The two homilies on Christmas Eve, copied in Hil 442//34/8, are copied one after another in the “Margarit”, 15th c., НБКМ 300, *миѡа декленеріа въ кѣ днь на рѡство хѡе и тогожде на рождѣствѣнь днь*. The both manuscripts contain two more homilies, attributed to Athanasius as well: *On the presentation of Christ to the temple* and *On the birth of John the Baptist*. The Greek source is not identified.

3. *Homily on the presentation of Christ to the temple*, НБКМ 300//28, 272б-279б, incip. *же настоѡцмаа сѣѡннааго трѣхѣства ꙗѡскаа трѡѡба да оглашаѣтъ и дѣѣстваном селі чрътог*, Hil 427, 310v–320v, Hil 444, 11v-28v, Hil 487, 236v-241r, Hil 489, 93r–105r, Hil 191, 10r-33v, Mircea records BAR 152, 63v (BAR 152 contents one more homily of Pseudo Athanasius, *On Ascension Domini*), 153, 113v, 304, 147v, 305, 131v, SB II285, 734r, Dragomirna 1773, 261v, Iași BCU VI240, 162 v. In BHBS, c. 462, are added Гилѡ 51, 182–196, Зогр 90, 60–69, Зогр 109, 172–?, PM 4/8, 10б–16б, Лавра Z52 174–188, НБКМ 443, 17б–35, ЗПМХ 72, 297–310. Greek in Migne, PG 28. 973–1000, BHG III, 242.

4. *Homily On Palm Sunday*, Слово за Цветница, Hil. 404 142r-143v *и цвѣтоноснѡхъ нѡа*, incip. *Отрашнѣ таннствоуѡхъ възлюбленни днѣ ѡрѡамъ въ*, in Hil 384, 340v-342r, Mircea records BAR 345, f. 40r *Отрашнѣ таннствоуѡхъ възлюбленни днѣ/с/ ѡрѡамъ въ таннствоуѡхъ ꙗѡа еже ѡ прѣкжъ проповѣданнѡхъ ѡ хѡ же съвршннѡхъ*, BAR 358, f. 57v, Dragomirna 1813 f. 382v, Arad Évêché, f. 65r, Schei 27, 111r, PM. In Hil. 404, before the Homily of Athanasius is copied Andreas of Kreta на цвѣтоносіи, after it follows the homily of Methodius

of Patara, в цѣкѣноскѣ нѣа, and two homilies of John Chrysostom. The Chrysostom's homilies are different form the text in Codex Suprasliensis, 318—332, but are preserved in Dragomirna 1813 too (Mircea 2005, 31, 97): в нѣа врьконоскѣ, incip. Се оуже доуховнаго трѣжѣства прѣсѣлѣт дарованіа, (Dragomirna 1813, 339v), and в цѣкѣноскѣ нѣа, incip. Прѣжде шесты днь пасхы приде ꙗко въ вѣтаніа (Dragomirna 1813, 378v). The set of Athanasius Homily and the two Chrysostom's homilies, as preserved in Hil. 404 and Dragomirna 1813, witnesses for a common prototype. Greek in Migne 26, 1309—1313 8• CPG 2236.

5. *Homily On Pasha*, Слово на Пасха, Hil 404, 204r слово на стѣхъ пасхѣ, incip. Ище аггелскыѣ еже хвалити въ настоѣщемъ члѣци стѣжани еишѣ азыки, Mircea 2005, 31, records BAR 156, 146r, 345, 149v. Greek in PG 28:1073—10926, CPG 2278—79.

6. *Sermon on Pasha*, BAR 299, f.60r acc. to Mircea 2005, 32, incip. Вѣчера прѣ ꙗко нароцѣ пасхы нѣкто глѣхольмъ понесежѣ къ нѣко распра се назнаменахольмъ въ нѣа ꙗко нашего ꙗко хѣ.

7. *Homily on the AntiPasha and Apostle Thomas*, BAR 345, 205v acc. to Mircea 2005, 31, incip. Хѣ вѣста ꙗко мѣтвѣи въсѣи члѣкѣтѣ жыны и праздниѣ съдѣла ꙗко земаа еѣ на нѣса житіе прѣложикъ, in NBKM 300, PG 28, 1081—1092. In the Minea of XIV c. like Zogr. 107 for the feast on 6.10 a Homily on the apostle Thomas and against the Arians is attributed to John Chrysostom.

8. *First Homily on the Ascension*, Hil. 404, 246ar—246av слѣ на вѣзнесеніи, incip. Не дождѣа кѣи пріимѣ азыкѣ къ настоѣщаго праздниѣ, Mircea 2005, 31 records BAR 149, 100v, 152, 422r, 156, 271r, 358, 69v, 549, 17v, Aras Évêché 10, 73v; preserved in NBKM 300, PG 28:1091—1100, CPG 2280.

9. *Second Homily on the Ascension* Hil 404, 246av—247av на вѣзнесеніи, incip. Вѣскрѣсеніа оубѣ памѣ еже на съмрътъ чакѣ дарѣ повѣдѣтелнаа; Mircea 2005, 31 records BAR 149, 103v, 152, 422r, 156, 273r, 551, 92r. Probably the set of Athanasius' homilies in Hil. 404, BAR 149, Bar 152 and BAR 156 stems from the same source. After the Athanasius' homilies in Hil 404 follows a *Homily on the Ascension* by Proclus of Constantinople, but in BAR 156, 111v follows an Ascension homily by Gregory of Nazianzus, incip. Вѣскрѣсеніа днь и начало десноа, identical with the Homily 29 in *Germanov Sbornik*. The homily 29 has been translated into Old Bulgarian twice, maybe the first translation is made by Constantin of Preslav (Mircheva, 2006, 179). The immediate environment of the Athanasius homilies on the Ascension indicates the existence of a Panegyric for the moveable feasts as a common source.

10. *Homily on God's commandments* Hil 473, 322v слово оглавлено къ заповѣдемъ бжѣианъ, incip. Вѣсѣмъ ѡрекшамъсе аира и хотѣшамъ спѣти се

Възлюблены поцѣль се ко вѣкли съкращено ю прочне, Rila 322v Възлюблены поцѣль се Mircea 2005, 31 records BAR 160 (dated 1360–1370), 165r, 161 (XV c.), 142v (b), 219 (XVI c.), 238v, 306 (XV c.), 126v, 315, 221v, 330, 75v, Neamt 147, 18r, Greek PG 28:1409–1420 iis qui saeculo renuntiarunt, CPG 2287.

12. *Homily on Annunciation* НБКМ 300, с. 94а слово прѣпрѣзвѣстною ѡ влѣгѣнїи, incip. Бжѣтїи проповѣдники не на нѣмоу слышанїа достѣнѣ възирати, Mircea 2005, 31 records BAR 150, f. 338v сїѣннопроповѣдники, PG 28, 917–940 (BHG, III, 170, 98t\l 147t).

13. *Homily on the born blind* (comments on Jo 9.1–4 and Mc 8.23, the last in Contra Arianos 3.41), Hil 404, 241av–242av слѡ ѡ нже рожѣнїа слѣпѣкаго, incip. Троуды оубѡ пактнїкомъ прїятнымъ прохладждатъ сѣни, Mircea 2005, 31 records BAR 149, f. 78v, 152, f. 418r, 156, f. 267v. This homily is copied in the same manuscripts, which content the two *Homilies on Ascension*. The 152 contents one more Athanasius homily *On the birth of John the Baptist* in miscellanea with identical set of Athanasius homilies, like HM.SMS 404 and 442¹⁴, BAR 156 and 345¹⁵, NBKM 300¹⁶.

14. *Homily on the birth of John the Baptist*, Mircea 2005, 31 records BAR 152, f. 75, incip. Нивоу оубѡ нсѣхїоу и звѣрѣмъ въ поспранїѣ ети оставленю ноль оратїани съ троудомъ развиваѣ пѣвѣжїкѣтъ гроуд BAR 152, 75v, 153, f. 325r, 305, f. 261r, Dragomirna 1880, f. 15v, PG 28, 905–913, BHG I, 283, 31/866. Copy in Ril.

Three fragments of Athanasius are preserved in BAR 296, f. 1r, incip. Бѣда глѣеть гѣ въ нсѣи снѣ роѣи и възкнїхъ въ еѣлїи же глѣеть рожѣнною ѡ пакти іѣ и рожѣнноа ѡ дѣха дѣхъ іѣ, 296, f. 118r, incip. Не тѣкѣю погрѣшаѣте глѣюре іако єдиноснѣ іѣ снѣ ѡцз нѣ іако и дѣшъ пакѣше въ пакти, 296, f. 193v, incip. Чѣто възвѣкїнное начинанїе пѣпнїкъ зєстрѣмленїс дѣшѣмъ гвѣнтѣано чѣстѣ рѣче своѣго сїчѣстѣна ѣѣ словѣмъ въспрїетъ пактѣ (Mircea 2005, 32).

¹⁴ See the catalog of the Hilandar library, <http://library.osu.edu/find/collections/hilandar-research-library/manuscript-collection/manuscript-collection-on-microform-in-the-hrl>, SPEC.HM.SMS.

¹⁵ In the catalogue of Mircea, 2005, 30–31.

¹⁶ About the manuscript see Ivanova, 2008, 91.

REFERENCES

- Aitzetmüller, Rudolf 1958–1971. *Das Hexaemeron des Exarchen Johannes*. 1. Graz, 1958, 2. Graz, 1960, 3. Graz, 1961, 4. Graz, 1966, 5. Graz, 1968, 6. Graz, 1971: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt.
- Aitzetmüller, Rudolf 1978. *Althulgarische Grammatik als Einführung in die Slavische Sprachwissenschaft*. Freiburg i. Br.
- Aitzetmüller, Rudolf, Matl Josef, Sadnik Linda (eds.) 1965. *Izbornik velikogo knjazja Svetoslava Jaroslavicha 1073 goda*, Monumenta linguae Slavicae dialecti veteris. Fontes et dissertationes III, Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz.
- Altaner, B., and A. Stuiber. 1966. *Patrologie*. Freiburg: Herder.
- Angelov Bonjo, Kuev Kujo, Kodov Hristo 1970. *Kliment Ohridski, Săbrani săčuinenija*, 1, Sofija: BAN.
- Athanasius of Aleksandria. 1887. "Orationes contra Arianos" I–IV in S. Athanasii Opp. I — Historica et Dogmatica, in J. P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologia Graeca*, 26, 1887, 111–526.
- Clement of Alexandria, *The Stromata*, VII, English translation of the New Advent, <http://www.monachos.net/content/patristics/patristictexts/334-clement-stromata-link>.
- Dejanova Marija 1970. *Istorija na složnite minali vremena v bălgarski, sārboharvatski i slovenski ezik*, Sofija: BAN.
- Donker, G. J. 2011. *The text of the Apostolos in Athanasius of Aleksandria*. Atlanta, USA.
- Ernest, James D. 2004. *The Bible in Athanasius of Alexandria*, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Georgieva, Todorka 2003. *Zlatostruj ot XII vek*, Silistra.
- Gaisford, Thomas (ed.) 1836. *Theodoreti Episcopi Cyrensis Greacarum affectionum curatio*, Oxford.
- Hansak, E. 1979. "Zum Übersetzungsstil des Exarchen Johannes". *Die Welt der Slaven* 24:121–171.
- Hoeps, R., Kölbl, A., Lois, E., Rauchenberger, J., Himmel Schewer. Transformationen der Schwerkraft, München 2003: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
- Ivanova, Klementina 1981. *Bălgarski, srăbski i moldovo-vlahijski kirilski răkopisi v sbirkata na M. Pogodin*, Sofija: BAN.
- Ivanova-Mirčeva, Dora 1971. *Joan Ekzarch Bălgarski. Slova 1*, Sofija: BAN.
- Ikonomova, Živka 1995. "Joan Ekzarch", *Kirilo-Metodievaska Enziklopedija*, 2, Sofija: Universitetsko izdatelstvo, 169–194.
- Jagič, Vatroslav 1954. *Codex Glagoliticus olim Zographensis nunc Petropolitanus* (Editiones Monumentorum Slavicorum Veteris Dialecti), Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt.

- Johannet, J. 1991. "Les Chapitres de définitions philosophiques dans l'Izbornik de 1073 (Édition gréco-slave)". *Revue des études slaves*, 63.
- Jurchenko, Andrej. *K probleme identifikacii odnogo iz drevnejših pamjatnikov slavjanskoj pis'mennosti, prežde izvestnogo kak "Napisanie o prevoj vere" syjatogo Konstantina-Kirilla, prosvetitelja slavjan* (textology.ru/urch/pv/pv1.pdf).
- Kuev, Kujo 1981. Ivan-Aleksandrovič sbornik ot 1348 g., Sofija: BAN
- Kurz, Josef, Vajs Josef (eds.) 1955. *Evangeliarum Assemani*, Pragae: Sumptibus Academiae Scientiarum Bohemoslovenicae.
- Kurz, Josef (ed.) 1989–1997 see *Lexicon Linguae Palaeoslovenicae*.
- Leskin Ju.D. 1996. *Šestodnev Joanna Ekzarcha Bolgarskogo. V slovo*, Moskva.
- Lexicon Linguae Palaeoslovenicae* 1989–1997: J. Kurz (ed.), *Lexicon Linguae Palaeoslovenicae*, Prague 1989–1997.
- Lägreid 1965: A. Lägreid, *Der rhetorische Stil im Šestodnev des Exarchen Johannes* (Monumenta linguae Slavicae dialecti veteris. Fontes et dissertationes 4), Wiesbaden 1965.
- Meijering 1994: Meijering, E. P., "Zur Echtheit der dritten Rede des Athanasius gegen die Arianer (Contra Arianos 3, 59–67)", *Vigiliae Christianae* 48, 1994, 135–156.
- Metzer, K., and Savvidis K. 1998–2000. *Athanasius Werke: Die Dogmatischen Schriften – Orationes, I et II Contra Arianos*, I, Teil 1, Lieferung 2. Berlin 1998; *Oratio III*, Lieferung 3, Berlin 2000.
- Migne 1884: J. P. Migne (ed.), "De incarnatione Verbi" *Patrologia Graeca* 25, 1884.
- Migne 1887: J. P. Migne (ed.), "Orationes contra Arianos" I–IV in S. Athanasii Opp. I – Historica et Dogmatica, *Patrologia Graeca*, 26, 1887, 111–526.
- Miltenov, Javor. 2013. *A new source for studying the Symeonian Zlatostruy Collection: Two Slavonic collections of Chrysostomian homilies, houth known as Zlatostruy (Chrysosorrhoas)*, www.academia.edu/1016649/ www.academia.edu/1016649/.
- Mirčev, Kiril 1978. *Istoričeska gramatika na bŭlgarskija ezik*, Sofija: BAN.
- Nachtigal, Rajko 1942. *Euchologium Sinaiticum*. Ljubljana.
- Penkova, Pirinka 2008. *Rečnik-Indeks na Sinajskija Evhologij*, Sofija: BAN.
- Penkova, Pirinka 2008a. "On the Authorship of *Сълание о празд'ницѣхъ* ascribed to Athanasius of Alexandria", *Scripta & e-Scripta*, vol. 6. Izdatelski centŕ "Bojan penev", 279–304.
- Penkova, Pirinka 2013. "Dve bogoslovski koncepcii i tehните gramatičeski registri v Preslavska knižnina", *Palaeobulgarica* XXXVII (2013), 1, 15–29.

- Sadnik, Linda 1963. "Eine Zweite Südslavische Übersetzung des Johannes Damascenus". In *Opera Slavica* 4, edited by M. Braun and E. Koschmieder. Göttingen, 281–284.
- Sadnik, Linda (ed.) 1967–1983. *Des Hl. Johannes von Damascus "Εκθεσις ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως in der Übersetzung des Exarchen Johannes*, vol.1. (Monumenta linguae Slavicae dialecti veteris. Fontes et dissertationes 5) Wiesbaden 1967: Otto Harassowitz; vol. 2. (Monumenta linguae Slavicae dialecti veteris. Fontes et dissertationes 14) Freiburg i. Br. 1981, vol.3. (Monumenta linguae Slavicae dialecti veteris. Fontes et dissertationes 16), Freiburg i. Br. 1983, vol. 4. (Monumenta linguae Slavicae dialecti veteris. Fontes et dissertationes 17) Freiburg i. Br. 1984: Weiher.
- Sels, L. 2006. "Lexical diversification versus terminological standardization. John the Exarch's *Bogoslovie* and *Šestodnev* and parallel 14th-century South Slavonic translations". *Mnogokratnite prevodi v južnoslavjanskoto srednovekovie*, Sofija: Goreks pres, 301–308.
- Slavova, T. 1989. "Preslavska redakcija na Kirilo-Metodievija starobŭlgarski evangelski prevod". *Kirilo-Metodievski studii* 6, Sofija: BAN, 15–129.
- Slavova, Tatjana 2008. "Joan Ekzarch", *Istorija na starobŭlgarskata srednovekovna literatura*. Sofija: Iztok-Zapad, 243–246.
- Spasova, M. 2004. "Citatie ot Psaltira v Učitelното evangelie", *Prevodite prez IXV stoletie na Balkanite* Sofija: Goreks Pres. София.
- Stančev, Krasimir 1995. "Kliment Ohridski", *Kirilo-Metodievskata Encuklopedia*, Sofija, Universitetsko izdatelstvo, 320–335.
- Stojkova, A. C. 2008. "Konstantin Preslavski". *Istorija na starobŭlgarskata srednovekovna literatura*. Sofija: Iztok-Zapad, 240–245.
- Stählin, O. (ed.) 1960. *Clement of Alexandria, Miscellanies (Stromata)*. Berlin.
- Ščepkin, Vjačeslav 1903. *Savvina kniga*, Sanktpeterburg: Izdanie Imperatorskoj Akademii nauk.
- Thomson, Francis J. 1991. "Les cinq traductions slavonnes du 'Libellus de Fide Orthodoxa' de Michel le Syncelle et les mythes de l'arianisme de saint Méthode, apôtre des Slaves, ou d'Hilarion, métropolitain de Russie, et de l'existence d'une Église arienne à Kiev". *Revue des études slaves* 63:22–35.
- Tihova, Marija 2012. *Starobŭlgarskoto Učitelno evangelie na Konstantin Preslavski* (Monumenta linguae Slavicae dialecti veteris, 58, Freiburg i. Br.: U.V. Weiher.
- Vaillant, A. 1954. *Discours contre les Ariens de Saint Athanase, Version slave et traduction en français*. Sofia.
- Van Wijk 1926: N. van Wijk, "Zur Vorgeschichte zweier altkirchenslavischer Sprachdenkmäler, II, Euchologium Sinaiticum", *Archiv für Slavische Philologie* XL, 1926, 272–273.

- Velčeva, Borjana 2004. "Tärnovskijat govor prez XIV vek", *Prevodite prez XIV stoletie na Balkanite*, Sofija: "Goreks Pres".
- Vincent, Markus 1996. *Pseudo-Athanasius, Contra Arianos IV*, Eine Schrift gegen Asterius von Kappadokien, Eusebius von Cäsarea, Markell von Ankyra und Photin von Sirmium, Supplement s to Vigiliae Christianae, vol. XXXVI, 1996, Leiden, New York, Köln: E. J. Brill.
- Weiher, E., ed. 1987. *Die Dogmatik des Johannes von Damaskus in der kirchenslavischen Übersetzung des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Monumenta linguae Slavicae dialecti veteris XXV), Freiburg i. Br.: U. W. Weiher.
- Weiher, E., S. O. Šmidt and A. I. Škurko. 2007. *Die Grossen Lesemenäen des Metropoliten Makarij, Uspenskij spisok, 1–8 Mai.*, (Monumenta linguae slavicae dialecti veteris XXXIX), Freiburg i. Br.: U. W. Weiher.
- Weinandy 2007: Th. G. Weinandy, *Athanasius, A theological introduction*, Washington DC, 2007.
- Weiher, E., S. O. Šmidt and A. I. Škurko. 2007. *Die Grossen Lesemenäen des Metropoliten Makarij*.