



ѪѪ. ВЕЛИКЫИ И ЧЪТНЫИ И БЛГВЪРНЗИ ГЪ НА КНА БЛЗГАРСКЫ ИМЕНЕ БОРИ. КРЪТЪАНОЕ ИМА ЕИ  
 МИХАИ. МЦА МАЛА ВЪ .Б. ДНЬ. СЪБОТНЫ ВЕР. СЪ БОРИ БОЛГАРЪ КРЪТИ Е. ВЪ ЛЪ ЕТХ БЕХТИ. ВО ИМА  
 ОЦА И СНА И СГГО ДХА. АМИНЬ.

The content of this colophon has been examined by a number of scholars,<sup>3</sup> and for our purposes it will be important to highlight several points. First, the colophon allows us to recognize that the translation of Athanasius' *Orationes* was done by Constantine of Preslav (9<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup> c.),<sup>4</sup> who is said to have been Methodius' disciple. This means that Constantine found himself in the midst of a grand translation program that started with the invention of the Old Slavonic letters by Methodius' brother Cyril-Constantine, and continued with an incredibly effective follow-up by Methodius and his disciples.<sup>5</sup> This work began in Moravia but achieved its biggest results afterwards in Bulgaria.<sup>6</sup> In this context, Constantine's translation of Athanasius represents one of numerous other projects that included a translation of Scriptural and liturgical texts, as well as patristic authors. The latter primarily included such church fathers as Gregory of Nazianzus (16 selected *Orationes*), Basil of Caesarea (*Homiliae in hexaemeron*), Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catecheticae orationes quinque*, *Catechesis Mystagogica*), John Chrysostom (numerous *Homilies*), Cyril of Alexandria (various commentaries), John of Damascus (*Expositio Fidei Orthodoxa*), and some others.<sup>7</sup>

Second, the colophon informs us that Constantine's translation was commissioned by the Bulgarian prince Symeon and copied by the monk Tudor Duksov whom scholars identify as a brother of the first Christian prince of Bulgaria Boris,<sup>8</sup> also known as Michael after Baptism. Tudor Duksov, who

<sup>3</sup> This colophon was first published by A. Gorskij, K. Nevostruev, *Opisanie slavjanskih rukopisej Moskovskoj sinodalnoj biblioteki*, Ot. 2, Č. 2, M., Sinodalnaja tipografija, 1859, pp. 32-43, n. 111. In 1984 the photocopies of this colophon from different manuscripts were published and discussed by K. Popkonstantinov, V. Konstantinova, *Kăm voproza za černorizec Tudor i negovata pripiska*, "Starobălgarska literatura", 15 (1984), pp. 106-118.

<sup>4</sup> On the person and translation work of Constantine of Preslav, see P. Penkova, *Vtoroto Slovo protiv arianite*, cit., pp. 66-76.

<sup>5</sup> For more details about this work, see A. E. Tachiaos, *Cyril and Methodius of Thessalonica: The Acculturation of the Slavs*, New York, Crestwood, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001.

<sup>6</sup> For a discussion about Constantine's translation work in the context of a much larger project of providing the Slavic nations with the Christian texts in their own language, see *Ibidem*, pp. 107-125.

<sup>7</sup> Regarding the translation work of various patristic texts into Old Slavonic, see *Ibidem*, pp. 136-139.

<sup>8</sup> According to A. Vaillant, *Discours contre les Ariens de Saint Athanase*. Version slave et traduction en français, Sofia, Académie des Sciences de Bulgarie, 1954, pp. 6-7.

added the colophon by his own hand, tells us that he did the copying work in the “New Golden Church” at the river Tyča known today as the Kamchiya that flows through Velikij Preslav. While it is not clear how we can interpret the phrase *въ лѣтъ етъхъ вѣхти* (denoting probably the year 6372 = 864) referring to the time when Boris baptized the people of Bulgaria,<sup>9</sup> there is a general consensus that the dates for the translation of *Orationes* (the year 6414/10<sup>th</sup> indict = 906 = ꙗꙗ. ѡѡ. ииѡѡ. ѡѡ.) and their further copying (the year 6415/11<sup>th</sup> indict = 907 = ѡѡ. ѡѡ. ѡѡ. ииѡѡ. ѡѡ.) are confused. It has been established that this confusion has to do with the fact that the later scribe who copied this translation misread the Glagolitic numbering while transliterating the dates with the Cyrillic letters. This was a common mistake that scribes made, and it is also reflected in our Athanasian manuscripts. They offer us the following readings of the dates (the manuscripts’ description, numbered from 1 to 10, is presented in the second half of this article):

## Translation dates:

ꙗꙗ. ѡѡ. ииѡѡ. ѡѡ.] MSS 1, 3, 10

ꙗꙗ. ѡѡ. ииѡѡ. ѡѡ.] MSS 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9

## Copying dates:

ѡѡ. ѡѡ. ииѡѡ. ѡѡ.] MSS 1, 3

ꙗꙗ ѡѡ ииѡѡѡѡ ѡѡ.] MSS 4, 5, 7, 8, 9

ꙗꙗ. ѡѡ. ииѡѡ. ѡѡ.] MS 10

In view of discrepancy between the dates of the year and the corresponding indicts, it has been suggested that we need to add one more year for these dates to be correct. Thus, we need to change the year 6414/10<sup>th</sup> indict = 906 (for the translation) and 6415/11<sup>th</sup> indict = 907 (for copying) to the year 6415/10<sup>th</sup> indict = 907, and 6416/11<sup>th</sup> indict = 908, respectively. The mistake in the dating was first noticed by two Russian scholars A. Gorskij and K. Nevostruev,<sup>10</sup> and later examined by French slavist A. Vaillant, who comments it as follows:

Ce précieux colophon d’époque vieux-slave remonte sûrement au premier copiste Théodore Doksov. Les années 6414=906 et 6415=907 ne concordent pas avec leurs indictions, qui sont 9 et 10: il faut lire 6415=907, indiction 10, et 6416=908, indiction 11, c’est-à-dire donner aux lettres ѡѡ et ѡѡ la valeur numérale qu’elles ont, non en cyrillique, mais dans l’alphabet glagolitique; le texte a été composé dans la glagolite ancienne, et le copiste qui l’a transcrit en cyrillique, lisant en glagolite \*ѡѡѡѡ, \*ѡѡѡѡ, a naturel-

<sup>9</sup> A. Gorskij, K. Nevostruev, *Opisanie slavjanskih rukopisej*, cit., 2.2, p. 33, say that this phrase is unexplainable. According to A. Vaillant, *Discours contre les Ariens de Saint Athanase*, cit., pp. 7-8, this phrase has a Turkish-Bulgarian origin, and he believes that it can be translated as meaning the year 6372=864.

<sup>10</sup> A. Gorskij, K. Nevostruev, *Opisanie slavjanskih rukopisej*, cit., 2.2, p. 33.

lement modifié le chiffre des mille, mais il a d'autant moins pensé à le faire pour celui des unités que les deux autres chiffres restaient sans changement.<sup>11</sup>

Scholars point to several possible reasons that might have led Constantine to undertake the translation project of Athanasius' *Orationes*. Of course, the most obvious one is related to the fact that the work itself was commissioned by the Bulgarian prince Symeon, as it follows from the data in the colophon. Symeon (864-927) received excellent theological and philosophical education in the University of Constantinople and was himself engaged in the translation work from Greek into Old Slavonic.<sup>12</sup> However, what made him commission the translation project of the anti-Arian polemical writing is not very clear because we have no direct indications as to whether the Church in Bulgaria was threatened by Arianism.<sup>13</sup>

In this regard, one reasonable suggestion, proposed by P. Penkova<sup>14</sup> and further supported by my own research,<sup>15</sup> is that Constantine's translation could have been occasioned by the *filioque* controversy. We know that Patriarch of Constantinople Photius (820-896) was outraged by the fact that the Frankish missionaries taught the doctrine of the Holy Spirit's double procession (*filioque*) in Bulgaria.<sup>16</sup> In his *Epistula Encyclica*, written on that occa-

<sup>11</sup> A. Vaillant, *Discours contre les Ariens de Saint Athanase*, cit., pp. 7.

<sup>12</sup> For a brief description of Symeon's education in Constantinople and the sources, see J. V. A. Fine, *The Early Medieval Balkans: A Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century*, Michigan, University of Michigan Press, 1991, p. 132.

<sup>13</sup> A. G. Kuzmin, *Zapadnye traditsii v russkom christianstve*, in *Vvedenie christianstva na Rusi*, M., Mysl, 1987, advances a hypothesis that Methodius was influenced by Arianism and that Symeon commissioned the translation of Athanasius' *Orationes* in view of the threat of Arianism coming from Ohrid. This hypothesis was rejected by F. J. Thomson who convincingly argued against it in his article *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 (1991), pp. 22-35. The rise of bogomilism in Bulgaria (whose teaching perceived Christ as a mere tool of God the Father similar to the way Arius understood Christ) is dated by the time of prince Peter (927-969) when the translation of *Orationes* had already been completed (cf. the Arian characteristics of bogomilism in D. Angelov, *Bogomilstvo*, Sofia, Bulvest, 1993, p. 171).

<sup>14</sup> P. Penkova, *Vtoroto Slovo protiv arianite*, cit., p. 23.

<sup>15</sup> V. V. Lytvynenko, *Recepcija antiarianskoj tematiki Afanasija Aleksandrijskogo. Čast 2: Slova protiv arian*, "Parrésia Revue pro východní křesťanství" [forthcoming].

<sup>16</sup> E.g. *Ep. Enc.* (ed. by V. Laourdas, L. G. Westerink, hrsg., *Photii Epistulae et Amphilochia*, B. 1, Leipzig, Teubner Verlag, 1983. p. 47): Ταύτην τὴν ἀσέβειαν οἱ τοῦ σκότους ἐκεῖνοι ἐπίσκοποι (ἐπισκότους γὰρ ἑαυτοὺς ἐπεφήμιζον) μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἀθεμίτων εἰς τὸ ἀπαλὸν ἐκεῖνο καὶ νεοσύστατον τῶν Βουλγάρων ἔθνος ἐνέσπειραν.

sion in early 867, he calls *filioque* a new heresy and argues that it contradicts the teaching of Athanasius.<sup>17</sup> On the other hand, we see that adherents of the *filioque* in the Carolingian West – Aeneas of Paris (died in 870) and Ratramnus of Corbie (died in 870) – appeal to Athanasius in order to argue precisely the opposite, namely, their own doctrine of the *filioque*.<sup>18</sup> Admittedly, the writings from which they quote are the ones that today scholars recognize as pseudo-Athanasian: *De incarnatione contra Apollinarem* (PG 26.1093-1166), *Sermon maior de fide* (PG 26.1263-1294), *Interpretatio in symbolum* (PG 26.1231-1232), *Dialogi contra Macedonianos* (PG 28.1291-1338), *Dialogi de sancta Trinitate quinque* (PG 28.1115-1286), *De Trinitate Libri XII* (PL 62.237-334), and *Symbolum Quicumque* (PG 28.1583).<sup>19</sup> Even then, however, the very fact that “Athanasius was one of the most authoritative of the Greek Fathers for the Carolingian theologians”,<sup>20</sup> is significant enough to

<sup>17</sup> *Ep. Enc.* (V. Laourdas, L. G. Westerink, hrsg., *Photii Epistulae et Amphilochia*, cit., p. 45): Πρὸς γάρ τοι τοῖς εἰρημένοις ἀτοπήμασιν καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἅγιον σύμβολον, ὃ πᾶσι τοῖς συνοδικοῖς καὶ οἰκουμενικοῖς ψηφίσμασιν ἄμαχον ἔχει τὴν ἰσχύν, νόθοις λογισμοῖς καὶ παρεγγράπτοις λόγοις καὶ θράσους ὑπερβολῇ κιβδηλεύειν ἐπεχείρησαν (ὃ τῶν τοῦ πονηροῦ μηχανμάτων), τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μόνον, ἀλλὰ γε καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι καινολογήσαντες... αὕτη [i.e. *filioque*] κατὰ τῶν εὐαγγελίων ἴσταται, πρὸς τὰς ἀγίας ἀπομάχεται συνόδους, τοὺς μακαρίους καὶ ἁγίους παραγράφεται πατέρας, τὸν μέγαν Ἀθανάσιον, τὸν ἐν θεολογίᾳ περιβόητον Γρηγόριον, τὴν βασιλείον τῆς ἐκκλησίας στολὴν, τὸν μέγαν Βασίλειον, τὸ χρυσοῦν τῆς οἰκουμένης στόμα, τὸ τῆς σοφίας πέλαγος, τὸν ὡς ἀληθῶς Χρυσόστομον. It is worth noting that Photius mentions Athanasius in his personal letter to the prince Boris written just before the rise of the controversy in 865 or middle of 866. For the Greek text of this letter, see V. Laourdas, L. G. Westerink, hrsg., *Photii Epistulae et Amphilochia*, cit. The Old Slavonic translation of this letter is published by T. Slavova, *Slavjanskijat prevod na Poslanieto na patriarch Fotij do knjaz Boris-Michail*, Sofija, Universitetsko izdatelstvo Kliment Ochridski, 2013. English translation is provided by D. S. White, J. R. Berrigan, trans., *The Patriarch and the Prince: The Letter of Patriarch Photios of Constantinople to Khan Boris of Bulgaria*, Brookline, Mass., Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1982. Most frequent references to Athanasius (no less than 24 times) are found in Photius’ two homilies devoted to Arianism. These anti-Arian homilies are numbered XV and XVI in *Photii Epistulae et Amphilochia*, cit.; and 36 and 37 in Σ. Ἀριστάρχης, ἔκδ., *Λόγοι καὶ ομιλίες τοῦ Φωτίου Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*, Κωνσταντινούπολις, 1900.

<sup>18</sup> For a helpful discussion of the *filioquist* polemic of these two authors, see R. Haugh, *Photius and the Carolingians: The Trinitarian Controversy*, Belmont, Massachusetts, Nordland Publishing Company, 1975, pp. 101-121; and V. Leppin, Der Westen, in *Athanasius Handbuch*, hrsg., P. Gemeinhardt, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2011, pp. 421-424.

<sup>19</sup> For the discussion of these pseudo-Athanasian texts in Aeneas of Paris and Ratramnus of Corbie, see R. Haugh, *Photius and the Carolingians*, cit., pp. 185-187.

<sup>20</sup> This is the conclusion of the study of Haugh, *Photius and the Carolingians*, cit., p. 185, which I share. For a view that doesn’t take *filioque* as a major issue during this time, see

make us think that he could be an essential part of the ammunition with which East and West did their battle against each other. If this was really so, then Constantine's translation of Athanasius' *Orationes* into Old Slavonic could be perceived as one of the means of countering *filioque* in Bulgaria. Be that as it may, the benefits of having these theological writings in the Old Slavonic language were undoubtedly immense for a country that had just converted to Christianity.

### Transmission of *Orationes* in Medieval Russia

Today, the only extant manuscripts of Constantine's translation are the ones that were copied in Velikij Novgorod and Moscow primarily in the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries. Apparently, the reason Athanasius' *Orationes* were copied there had to do with the rise of the so-called heresy of the Judaizers (*židovstvujuschie*) that appeared in the second half of the 15<sup>th</sup> c. This teaching denied (among other things) the divine nature of Christ and the doctrine of the Trinity.<sup>21</sup> We possess two direct witnesses that relate the copying of Athanasius' *Orationes* to the fight against this teaching conducted by the Novgorodian Archbishop Gennadij (1410-1505). The first one is found in Gennadij's letter to the former Archbishop of Rostov and Jaroslavl' Ioasaf (died in 1514) sent in the year 1489.<sup>22</sup> In this letter Gennadij expresses his concern over the rise of a new teaching that rejects (among other things) Christ's divine nature and the doctrine of the Trinity. At one point he inquires of Ioasaf as to whether he has twelve specific books needed for countering that teaching. The second of these books is called simply "Athanasius of Alexandria":

ДА ѿ ли ѿ вѣ в кириловѣ, или в фѣрфѣтовѣ, или на каменнѣ, книги, селивестръ папа рѣскы, да афанаси александрийскы, да слово кѣмы прозвѣтера, на новоавльшѣю ересь на богѣмилю. да посланіе фотѣва патрїарха, ко кнѣзю борисѣ болгарьскомѣ. да прѣрѣства. да быпа. да црѣтва, да прѣчи. да менандръ. да іѣоу сѣраховѣ. да логика. да девниисен дрепаути. занѣ тѣ книги, оу еретикѣ ѿ.<sup>23</sup>

F. Dvornik, *The Photian Schism: History and Legend*, Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1948, repr. 1970, pp. 196-198.

<sup>21</sup> The reconstruction of the teaching of the Judaizers is quite complex because almost nothing has survived of their own writings. The best treatment of this issue is found in a recent study by A. I. Aleksejev, *Religioznye dviženija na Rusi poslednej treti XVI-načala XVI v.: strigolniki i židovstvujuschie*, M., Indrik, 2012.

<sup>22</sup> See the published text of this letter with a brief introduction about the text in N. A. Kazakova, J. S. Lur'je, *Antifeodalnye eretičeskie dviženija na Rusi XIV-načala XVI v.*, M.-L., Izdatelstvo AN SSSR, 1955, pp. 315-320.

<sup>23</sup> RGB, Tro. F.304, 730, f. 252<sup>v</sup>.



the Iosifo-Volokolamskij Monastery.<sup>29</sup> As it will be shown in my brief overview of the Athanasian manuscripts, most of the existing codices were copied in Velikij Novgorod, and the earliest and most important ones were in some way connected with Gennadij's strategy to combat the heresy.

The second, and perhaps most clear, witness about the way Athanasius' *Orationes* were copied for a very specific purpose is the information in the colophon of the scribe Timofej Veniaminov, whom I have just mentioned. It tells us that the work of copying Athanasius was done in Velikij Novgorod and occasioned by the rise of heresy. That heresy was promoted both by clergy and laypeople, and had to do with their attack on the most fundamental Orthodox beliefs, specifically the doctrine of the Trinity: в то лѣто здесе въ преимѣнитѣхъ тѣхъ неуполече(е) мнози сѣценники и дѣакони; и ѿ простыхъ людѣи дѣаки явилися сквернителѣи на вѣрѣ непорочнѣю велика бѣда постигла грѣхъ сеи и колника тма и тѣгда постиже мѣсто се сѣтѣю вѣрѣ православіа что запечатлѣша сѣтѣи ѿцѣи седмъ събвр; проповѣдѣю ѿцѣа и сѣна и сѣтго дѣха въ трѣци едѣно бжѣтво нераздѣлимо.

Right after this statement, it is said that the task of fighting the heresy was taken up by the Novgorodian Archbishop Gennadij whom God granted grace to expose the wickedness of those heretics: Нѣ въскорѣ исплѣнися о бѣзѣ блѣти; дѣха сѣтадо. пресѣцнны дѣрхїепискѣ генадїе; ѿбнажилъ ѣ еретичѣства злодѣиство. A major part of how Gennadij countered the heresy (besides copying Athanasius and other books) was to produce the first complete Old Slavonic Bible (in the year 1499) in his scriptorium. It was an event of major significance, and my own research (yet to be published) has allowed me to conclude that Timofej used Gennadij's Bible to correct certain Biblical passages in the text of Athanasius' *Orationes*.

Of course, apart from the question of why *Orationes contra Arianos* were copied in Novgorod, it is legitimate to ask how this writing appeared there in the first place. So far, this issue has received the most attention from P. Penkova,<sup>30</sup> and she suggests that it could have been brought there from the scriptorium of the Evergetida monastery in Constantinople. She argues that the second *Oratio* demonstrates similar variants found in the two Greek manuscripts (Patmiacus A 4 and Patmiacus A 3) that came from that scriptorium. In addition, she points out that "from the Evergetida monastery comes the famous Novgorod 'dogmatic' Icon 'The Annunciation of Ustyug', 11<sup>th</sup> c.," and she believes that "the geographical path to transfer the copy of Constan-

<sup>29</sup> This information is based on the colophon in Moscow, RGB Vol. F.113, 437, ff. 237<sup>r</sup>-237<sup>v</sup> and is discussed below.

<sup>30</sup> P. Penkova, *Vtoroto Slovo protiv arianite*, cit. pp. 14-18.

tine's translation to Novgorod was via Constantinople because the icon illustrated Athanasius' doctrine of the Logos".<sup>31</sup>

It is possible that Athanasius' *Orationes* may not have appeared in Russia till they were needed by Gennadij.<sup>32</sup> The earliest record that shows the presence of this writing in Russia (apart from the witness of our ten manuscripts) is 16<sup>th</sup> c. This record appears in the so-called *True Books Indices* that represent Russian monastic catalogues of recommended literature (somewhat similar to the Western *Decretum Gelasianum* in PL 59, 157-179), and scholars believe that they are indicative of what was and was not available in medieval Russia. We possess 87 manuscripts of such *Indices* from the 15<sup>th</sup> c., and 42 manuscripts from the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> c., but the only records that make a direct mention of *Orationes contra Arianos* are 31 manuscripts from the 16<sup>th</sup> c.<sup>33</sup>

It is worth noting that the only genuine writings of Athanasius that were spread in Russia besides *Orationes* are *Vita Antonii*, *Epistula ad Amun*; *Epistula ad Rufinianum*; "Bible canon" from the 39<sup>th</sup> *Epistula Festales*, and *Epistula ad Marcellinum de interpretatione Psalmorum*. In our study with I. M. Gricevskaja,<sup>34</sup> we point out that pseudo-Athanasian writings (including those that are not witnessed in Greek) had a much bigger popularity among the Russian Slavs than his genuine and more sophisticated theological writings. We have been able to identify around 50 of such writings in the manuscripts that range from the 12<sup>th</sup> through 17<sup>th</sup> c., and we argue that they shaped a very different profile of Athanasius from the one found in Greek. One particularly interesting feature of the Old Slavonic Athanasius in Novgorod and the nearby city Pskov is that he was prayed to on occasions of epidemic and military threat from the enemy. Athanasius was believed to have stopped the epidemic in Novgorod (1390) and Pskov (1407), as well as to have thwarted the Mongol troops, and thus save the Novgorodian people from the sudden invasion in 1238.<sup>35</sup> On such occasions, several churches were built and named after Athanasius.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>31</sup> P. Penkova, *Treto Slovo protiv arianite*, p. 543.

<sup>32</sup> V. V. Lytvynenko, *Recepcija antiarianskoj tematiki Afanasija Aleksandrijskogo*. Čast 2, cit.

<sup>33</sup> These observations are based on the study of the *True Books Indices* by I. M. Gricevskaja, *Indeksy Istinnych Knig*, SPb., Bulanin, 2003, esp. p. 230, where she gives a comparative "Table" with Manuscripts and Church Fathers' works. My analysis of Athanasius in the *True Books Indices* is described in V. V. Lytvynenko, *Recepcija antiarianskoj tematiki Afanasija Aleksandrijskogo*. Čast 2, cit.

<sup>34</sup> V. V. Lytvynenko, G. M. Gricevskaja, *Sočinenija Afanasija Aleksandrijskogo v slavjanskoj traditsii*. Čast I: *Podlinnye sočinenija*, "Byzantinoslavica" [forthcoming].

<sup>35</sup> On this see, O. V. Loseva, *Afanasij Velikij. Počitanije*, in *Pravoslavnaja entsiklopedija*, T. 4, M., 2008, 22-49.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibidem*.



vetskij monastery (where Dosifej was the abbot) made in the year 1514. This record mentions Athanasius (книгѣ офанассѣа александрѣова) among 46 other books.<sup>44</sup> Given the fact that Dosifej ordered many of his books from Velikij Novgorod and was a close associate of the Archbishop Gennadij, Novgorod is the most likely place for the copying of this manuscript.<sup>45</sup>

[3] Moscow, RGB Nikif. F.199, 59, late 15<sup>th</sup> and early 16<sup>th</sup> c.<sup>46</sup> This manuscript contains a shortened version of Tudor Duksov's colophon on f. 297<sup>r</sup>; its first part is slightly modified, and the second is omitted.<sup>47</sup> It also has the scribe's own colophon on f. 297<sup>v</sup>, where he calls himself Feofan.<sup>48</sup> According to the owner's note, this manuscript belonged to a certain Kirilov monastery (Сѣа бѣодрѣхновѣнаа книга кирилова монастыря великихъ ѡдотворѣ). This could or might not be the Kirillo-Belozerskij Monastery.

[4] Moscow, RGB Vol. F.113, 437, year 1488.<sup>49</sup> This is a Sammelband manuscript written by two different scribes. The Athanasian corpus comes first on ff. 1<sup>r</sup>-237<sup>v</sup>, and the rest of the manuscript, containing non-Athanasian works, occupies ff. 238<sup>r</sup>-330<sup>v</sup>. There are two colophons added by the scribe. The shorter one comes at the end of the fourth *Oratio* (on f. 217<sup>v</sup>)<sup>50</sup> and tells us that the scribe finished copying Athanasius' four *Orationes* on October 16<sup>th</sup> in the year 6997 (= 1488) (писѣ послѣнего сѣа зѣ ѣд; дѣ го октѡмврѣо. іѣ.). The second and much longer colophon (ff. 237<sup>r</sup>-237<sup>v</sup>)<sup>51</sup> adds that the

<sup>44</sup> Z. V. Dmitrieva, E. V. Krušelnitskaja, M. I. Mil'čik, *Opisi Solovetskogo monastyrja XVI veka*, SPb., Bulanin, 2003, p. 34.

<sup>45</sup> N. N. Rozov, *Solovetskaja biblioteka i ego osnovatel igumen Dosifej*, cit., pp. 294-304.

<sup>46</sup> This manuscript is described in an unpublished catalogues at RGB in Moscow, p. 20 (<http://new.search.rsl.ru/record/004724331>).

<sup>47</sup> Сѣа книги. бѣодрѣхновѣа наричѣмыа адрѣна. повелѣнїемъ кнѣзѣа сѣмѣвна бѣлѣгарьскаго. прѣложѣа епѣпѣз константинѣз в словенскѣа ѣззыкѣ ѡ грѣчѣска. в лѣтѣ ѣѣ. ѣ. дѣ. индикта. і. написа же а тѣдорѣз черноризецѣ. на ѣстїи тыча в лѣтѣ. ѣѣѣ. ѣ. еѣ. индикта. дѣ.

<sup>48</sup> Се а мноѣ грѣбныи рѣ бжїи девѣнѣз списѣа сїю бѣодрѣхновѣнѣю книгѣа мноѣрѣшную рѣкою. И гдѣ бѣдѣа вписалса словѣа или строкѣа искривїи, и хѣто ѣчїнѣе еѣ чѣсти и вы ѡцѣ свѣтїи бѣлѣовитѣ а не кленитѣ. хѣто либо гдѣа поспешїи или не ѣ догѣа. или неразѣжмїѣе или глѣпостѣю.

<sup>49</sup> This manuscript was first described by the hieromonk Iosif, *Opis rukopisej perenesennyh iz biblioteki Iosifova monastyrja v biblioteku Moskovskoj duchovnoj akademii*, M., Univ. tipografija M. Katkova, 1882, pp. 73-74, and later by B. L. Fonkič, *Grečesko-russkie kul'turnye svjazi v XV-XVII vv. (Grečeskie rukopisi v Rossii)*, M., Nauka, 1977, pp. 26-37.

<sup>50</sup> Досѣлѣ кнѣнѣ о сѣцѣемъ словеснѣ. бѣз ѣлѣколюбивѣи. да покрѣѣ нас; своѣо бѣлѣтїю всѣѣ сѣтѣи. писѣа послѣнего сѣа зѣ ѣд; дѣ го октѡмврѣо. іѣ. прѣвѣдѣа вѣз памѣти силѣа глѣмы. дарѣди бжѣ.

<sup>51</sup> Вѣзсевидѣцѣа бѣз и прѣвѣлѣомѣа слава и величїа дѣрѣжава и ѡвластѣ в бесконѣчныа вѣскы амин. давшемѣа по начѣлѣа и конѣц. всѣакомѣа дѣвалѣа бѣлѣа иже ѡ немъ начѣнаѣмомѣа. сподобашемѣа и мене недостоинѣо; прѣплѣдїи пѣчїнѣа сїю. лѣтѣа ѣѣ. ѣ. девѣдѣсѣа седмаго. декѣврѣо; вѣз седмыа вѣз дѣ, ѣс; ноци. послѣжїста рѣцѣа мон. амѣрталос; Тїмодѣа венїаминѣова. И выа господїѣе мон прѣчитѣитѣ сїю книгѣа. сѣрѣчныаа оочїма; дѣхѣовныи же крїлы достїзаѣоце ѣже писаннаа здѣа врѣховнѣи ѣстроѣнїемъ сѣдѣлѣовѣса сѣа вѣвлѣос. чѣрнїлнѣоѣ ѣислѣо мѣврѣа ѣавлѣѣа кождѣоѣ свїдѣтѣлѣства кажѣымъ книгѣамъ. ѣакѣо радѣѣѣтѣса



[6] St. Petersburg, RNB Sol. 63, 16<sup>th</sup> c.<sup>56</sup> According to the stamp placed on f. 6<sup>r</sup>, this manuscript used to belong to Kazan Spiritual Academy, whereas now it is kept in the Russian National Library in Saint Petersburg. It is dated to the 16<sup>th</sup> century.

[7] St. Petersburg, RNB Sof. VMČ 1321, no later than 1541.<sup>57</sup> This manuscript was written in Velikij Novgorod as part of twelve other books within the collection of the Sofijskie manuscripts of the Great Menaia Reader (Velikie Minei Četii). The work on this manuscript was commissioned and assisted by the Metropolitan of Moscow and all Russia Makarius. In 1541 Makarius placed these Menaia in the Cathedral of St. Sophia in Velikij Novgorod. Athanasius' *Orationes* are contained in the May volume of the Sofijskoe collection of VMČ under May 2.

[8] Moscow, GIM Sin. Tsa. VMČ 180, no later than 1554.<sup>58</sup> This manuscript was written in Velikij Novgorod and/or Moscow as part of twelve other books within the collection of the Tsarskie manuscripts of the Great Menaia Reader (Velikie Minei Četii). The work on this manuscript was commissioned and assisted by the Metropolitan of Moscow and all Russia Makarius. It was finished in 1554, and Athanasius' *Orationes* are contained in the May volume of the Tsarskoe collection of VMČ under May 2.

[9] Moscow, GIM Sin. Usp. VMČ 994, no later than 1552.<sup>59</sup> This manuscript was written in Velikij Novgorod and/or Moscow as part of twelve other books within the collection of the Uspenskie manuscripts of the Great Menaia Reader (Velikie Minei Četii). The work on this manuscript was commissioned and assisted by the Metropolitan of Moscow and all Russia Makarius. In 1552 Makarius placed these Menaia in the Cathedral of the Dormition at the Moscow Kremlin. Athanasius' *Orationes* are contained in the May volume of the Uspenskoe collection of VMČ under May 2.

[10] Moscow, RGB Ovč. F.209, 99, 18<sup>th</sup> c. or earlier.<sup>60</sup> According to the unpublished catalogue that describes this manuscript in the Russian State Library (p. 21),<sup>61</sup> it is dated to the 18<sup>th</sup> c. However, since no watermark information is provided and there are no other indications within the manuscript for dating it, it is not certain that 18<sup>th</sup> c. is the correct date. Besides the common texts present in all manuscripts, this codex has the biggest number of its own writings related to Athanasius.

<sup>56</sup> This manuscript is described by I. Ja. Porfiriev, A. V. Vadkovskij, N. F. Krasnoseltsev, *Opisanie rukopisej Solovetskogo monastyrja nahodjaschiesja v biblioteke Kazanskoj duhovnoj akademii*, Č. 1, Kazan, Tipografija Imperskogo Universiteta, 1881, pp. 224-225.

<sup>57</sup> This manuscript is described by D. I. Abramovič, *Opisanie rukopisej S.-Peterburgskoj duhovnoj akademii. Sofijskaja biblioteka*, Vypusk II, Četii Minei. Prologi. Pateriki, SPb., Tipografija Imperatorskoj AN, 1907, pp. 94-95.

<sup>58</sup> This manuscript is described by A. Gorskij, K. Nevostruev, *Opisanie Velikih Čettich Minej Makarija mitropolita vsrossijskogo*, s predisloviem i dopolnenijami E. V. Barsova, K. 1, Ot. 2, Moskva, Universitetskaja tipografija, 1886, p. 170.

<sup>59</sup> This manuscript was first described by T. N. Protasieva, *Minei Četii: Opisanie rukopisej Sinodalnogo sobranija (ne vošedšych v opisanie A. V. Gorskogo i K. I. Nevostrueva)*, Č. I. M., 1970, pp. 182-183, and later in *Die Grossen Lesemenaen*, cit., pp. XL-CX.

<sup>60</sup> This manuscript is described in the unpublished catalogue of RGB in Moscow on p. 21 (<http://dlib.rsl.ru/viewer/01004724424#?page=1>, used on March 7, 2017).

<sup>61</sup> <http://dlib.rsl.ru/viewer/01004724424#?page=1> (used on March 7, 2017).

### Abstract

Old Slavonic Translation of *Orationes Contra Arianos*. Reasons for Translation and the Issue of Transmission

This article examines the Old Slavonic translation of Athanasius' main theological work *Orationes contra Arianos* by discussing the reasons for translation and the issue of transmission. It also provides a brief description of all existing manuscripts known today that preserve this translation originally made by Constantine of Preslav in 907 in Bulgaria.

Keywords: Athanasius, *Orationes contra Arianos*, Constantine of Preslav, Filioque, Medieval Russia, The Judaizers.