



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*, Сур 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, *Златоструят 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.п.И.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 [= VTS, 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*, Or.JPTSIS 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 средневековье. Доклады от международной конференции, София, 7–9 июля 2005 г.*, ed. Л. ТАСЕВА, 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 нзвнранигъ...* (MTA 43, ff. 100v–103v). *InAA hom. 34, PG, vol. LX, col. 250–252.*
- L40 Inc.:** *То дѣн ли богъ немощна...* (MTA 43, ff. 251v–254v). *InAA hom. 23, PG, vol. LX, col. 182–184.*
- L41 Inc.:** *Къде сжтъ оубо женгы ѡже всѣж ношь...* (MTA 43, ff. 254v–257r). *InAA hom. 26, PG, vol. LX, col. 202–204.*
- L42 Inc.:** *Нъ да поманемъ н тж ношь...* (MTA 43, ff. 257r–258v). *InAA hom. 36, PG, vol. LX, col. 261–262.*
- L86 Inc.:** *Да не можѣте мьнѣти къ намъ се тѣхунѣж бесѣдоуемо...* (MTA 43, ff. 448v–450v). *InAA hom. 44, PG, vol. LX, col. 312–314.*
- L88 Inc.:** *Вѣдѣше ны рекъша оу негоже...* (MTA 43, ff. 452r–454r). *InAA hom. 45, PG, vol. LX, col. 317–319.*
- L90 Inc.:** *Не тольма во чловѣци на благодѣянне оурижтъ сѡ...* (MTA 43, ff. 456v–459r). *InAA hom. 6, PG, vol. LX, col. 60–62.*
- L102 Inc.:** *Икоже во н съ христосомъ ѡдѣше н пнѣше...* (MTA 43, ff. 490v–493r). *InAA hom. 1, PG, vol. LX, col. 22–26.*
- L104 Inc.:** *О великѣ днвѣ...* (MTA 43, ff. 494r–497r). *InAA hom. 24, PG, vol. LX, col. 187–192.*
- S22 Inc.:** *Снхъ н мгы подражанигъ...* (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 н крѣвнн**, and **σφῦρα** 'hammer' – **млатъ кладнво**: PG, vol. LX, col. 203 *ὁ χαλκοτύπος σφῦραν οὕτω βαρεῖαν καταφέρων / like the smith who lets fall such a heavy hammer*²⁰ – МТА 43, f. 256r **акы златарь н крѣ[м]внн. млатъ кладнво. толь тажько на римо вѣзвѣда**. In this phrase there are many variant readings between the manuscripts, e.g. instead of **златарь н крѣвнн** (the mistake **крѣмвнн** is also widely spread) one Hilandar manuscript²¹ has only **крѣвнн**, the 12th century copy of S – **коузнѣци**; instead of **кладнво**, there are variant readings **кладнвѣ**, **кладнвы**, even a correction to **клада**, and S and the Hilandar manuscript have only **млатъ**. It is easy to suggest that the proto-Bulgarian word **крѣвнн** needed a more common clarifying synonym (**златарь**), but it is more difficult to explain the asyndeton **млатъ кладнво** – **млатъ** is attested as early as Codex Suprasliensis, but **кладнво** 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 Doppeliübersetzungen: 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 рекѣше 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 Златоструя 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 **кладнво** 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.

φιλόανθρωπος – L42 **УЛОВЕЌКОУЮЩЬИИ Н МИЛОСТИВЪ** with ‘loving mankind’ being the formal equivalent, and ‘merciful’ – the semantic one;

ἀλγέω – L86 **ЖАЛНТИ Н БОЛѢТИ**, where ‘feel pain’ renders the form, and ‘grieve’ – the meaning;

οἱ κατορθοῦντες ‘the righteous’ – L40 **ДОВРНИИ Н ПРЪКНИИ** (‘straight, upright’ – the form, ‘good’ – the meaning);

καθαρός – L86 **БЕЗЪ ЗАЗОРА Н ЧИСТЪ** (‘clean’ – the form, ‘flawless’ – the meaning);

ἀναπνέω ‘take breath, recover’ – L41 **ОПЪДЪХНЪТИ Н ОΥΣΤΟΥΔΗΤΗ СΛ** (‘take breath’ – the form, ‘cool down’ – the meaning), etc.

In most of the cases the two translations are connected by the conjunction ‘and’, but there are also more complicated and descriptive phrases, such as:

ἄμοιρος ‘without share, bereft of’, here in the context of baptism – PG, vol. LX, col. 23 ἀπελθὼν ἄμοιρος τῆς χάριτος / *departs this life with no portion in that grace*²³, i.e. unbaptized – the Slavonic translation in L102 has **ПОГАНЪ НЕ ПРНИИЪ ДАРА ТΟΥ** with the periphrastic, albeit not entirely literal translation “who did not receive this gift”, and **ПОГАНЪ** bearing the overall meaning ‘pagan, heathen’.

One example is particularly interesting and indicative. The Greek word **ψυχή** ‘soul’ has a simple and exact Slavonic match – **ДОУША**, yet in the *Zlatostruy* homilies on *Acts* it is repeatedly rendered with double translations ‘soul and mind’, ‘soul and heart’ (**ДОУША Н ОУМЪ**, **ДОУША Н ЖТРОБА**) in at least four different homilies.

S22 has two instances:

PG, vol. LX, col. 39 Οὐδὲν πλοίου κλυδωνιζομένου διενήνοχεν ἢ τοῦ ἱερέως ψυχή / *The soul of a Bishop is for the world like a vessel in a storm*²⁴ – F.п.І. 46, f. 44a **НИЧНИМЪЖЕ ЛОДНІА ПОГРЪЗНОУТИ ХОТѢША. НѢСТЬ ОУНЪШН НІЕРЪНСКА ДЪША Н ОУМЪ**;

PG, vol. LX, col. 42 ἐπεὶ τῇ λυπουμένη ψυχῇ καὶ παρενοχλεῖν δοκεῖ / *to a sorrowful heart it seems even to be a trouble*²⁵ – F.п.І. 46, f. 46a **А ПЕЧАЛЬНѢ ДЪШН Н ОУМОУ. АЩЕ СНАЕТЕЪ ТО Н ТΟΥГОУ ТВОРИТЕЪ**.

Homily L90 is also consistent in this respect:

PG, vol. LX, col. 61 Ἀλλὰ ταύτης τῆς ἐρημίας ἡδίων πολλῶ τοῦ μακροθύμου ἢ ψυχῇ / *But sweeter far than this solitude is the soul of the longsuffering*²⁶ – MTA 43, f. 458r **НЪ ПΑΚΟΔ ΠΟΥΡΤΥΝΙΔ ΣΑΔЖІН ЕСТЬ ДУМЪ Н ДЪША ТРЪПЪЛЕНΒΑΓΟ УЛКА Н ΚΡΟΤΚΑΓΟ**

²³ CHRYSOSTOM, vol. I, p. 17.

²⁴ CHRYSOSTOM, vol. I, p. 47.

²⁵ CHRYSOSTOM, vol. I, p. 52.

²⁶ CHRYSOSTOM, vol. I, p. 92.

(later in the same passage ψυχή is rendered with оумъ at least two more times, the other double translation from this sentence – μακρόθυμος ‘long-suffering, patient’ кротъкъ ѡ трѣпѣливъ – 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 ДОВОЛЕѢ ТИ ВЪЗЪВОУДНТИ ДШС Н ОУМЪ ОУСТАВНТИ** (ψυχή is rendered with оумъ 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 ШНШОУ ТВОРН ДШС Н ОУТРОБОУ** (followed by 2Cor 7, 2 **ВМЪЕСТНТЕ СД ВЪ МД РЕВЕ АПЛЪ**, where the idea of κτηρεα as a vessel is contextually more appropriate).

I am not aware of another Slavonic work in which ψυχή is translated as доуша н оумъ and it is one of the characteristic features of the Slavonic translation of Chrysostom's homilies on Acts²⁹.

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.:

σφριγᾶω ‘to be vigorous, in full health and strength’ – L12 **ЮНЪ Н ТΟΥΥНЪ ВЪИТИ** ‘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 оумъ 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. оумъ).

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 Übersetzungstil...*, p. 135.

προσκυνέω ‘fall down and worship’ – L88 **КЛАНІАТИ СѦ Н МОЛІТИ СѦ** with the same meaning;

παννυχίς ‘watching all night, vigil’ – L41 **ВЪСТАНИИ Н МОЛІТВА** ‘rising and prayer’ (in the same homily there is another – single – translation of **παννυχίς** as **ОБНОЩІИ**, whereas in S22 the translation is descriptive – **НОЩІЮ СТРАЖЕМЪ БѦ МОΛΑΨΙΕ**);

συναλίζομαι ‘come together’, literally ‘eat salt with’ – L102 **ІАСТН Н ПІТН** (a reference to Act 1, 4, the Old Church Slavonic translation of *Acts* has only **ІАСТН**).

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 **МЪДРОΛΟΓІЕ**, **ΛΟΒΟМЪДРОСТВО**, **ПРЪМЪДРОСТЪ**, **МЪДРОСТЪ** (‘wisdom’, ‘love of wisdom’) and even the untranslated Greek word **ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦІА** in L8, but also **ВЪЗДРЪЖАНІИ** (‘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 **КРЪКОСТЪ Н СЪМЫСЛЪ** ‘strength and reason’, **φιλόσοφος** **СЪМЫСΛΗΝЪ**
НЛИ ВЪЗДРЪЖА СѦ ‘reasonable or self-restrained’, **КРЪПЪКЪ Н ВЪЗДРЪЖА 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**).

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 **СТЪГНА Н ДВОРЪ** 'street and yard' and this translation is used twice in the homily:

PG, vol. LX, col. 204 Ἐκεῖνοι δι' ἀνθρώπινον νόμον περιΐασιν ἐν κρυμῶ 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, ΜΤΑ43, f. 256v **ТН БО ВЛѢЪСКА ЗАКОНА Д'ЕЛА Н БОДЗНН. ХОДѢ В СЮ НОЩЬ ТРѢПЕШОУЩЕ ЗНМОЮ. Н ВЪПЇОУЩЕ ВЕЛ'МН СКВОЗ'Ѣ СТЕГНЫ ХОДАЩЕ. Н БЛЮДОУЩЕ ДВОРЫ** (the whole phrase διὰ τῶν στενωπῶν βαδίζοντες is repeated);

PG, vol. LX, col. 202 Ἄν διακύψης **εἰς τὸν στενωπὸν**, οὐκ ἀκούση οὐδὲ φωνῆς· ἂν ἴδῃς **εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν**, πάντας ὅψει 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, ΜΤΑ43, f. 256v **ѠЩЕ БО СНИКНЕСИ НА СТЕГНЫ <с> ПОЛАТЫ ТО НЕ СЛЫШИШИ ГЛѢСА, НЇ ННОГО ННУТѢ. ѠЩЕ ЛИ СНИКНЕСИ ВЪ ДВОРЪ СВОН С ПОЛАТЫ. ТО ВСЕ ВИДИШИ АКЫ ВЪ ГРОБѢ ЛЕЖАЩЕ.** Although the second example is not a double translation and **ДВОРЪ** could be a mistake instead of the correct ***ДОМЪ**, I think it is no accident that the same words **СТЪГНА** and **ДВОРЪ** are used in this context.

The next examples are less controversial: the word **βασιλειον** (τὰ βασιλεια) 'kingly dwelling, palace' is rendered in two different homilies with similar double translations – in L40 as **ПОЛАТЫ Н ВЛАСТЕЛЕ** and in S22 as **ВЪ ПОЛАТЫ КЪ ВЛАДЪКАМЪ**. Both solutions are contextually appropriate and suggest a single translator. The closest counterpart of **βασιλειον** in the earliest Slavonic literature is **ПОЛАТЫ Ц'КЕАРД** 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. BLAHOVÁ, Praha 2008 (s.v. βασιλειος).

Some of the other contextual synonyms are the following:

ἄλογον ‘speechless, without reason; animal’ – L12 **конь или скотъ или** ‘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 **нищъ и страньнъ** ‘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 **искоуцьнъ и славьнъ** ‘skilful and renowned’, and **ἄδοκιμος** ‘unsatisfactory, discredited’ – as **ненскоуцьнъ и неславьнъ**;

εὐδοκμέω ‘to be of good repute, to be distinguished in’ in L40 is **славьнъ и искоуцьнъ быти** (‘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 **славьнъ** is an etymological translation of the root **-δοκ-**, cf. **δόξα** ‘repute, glory’, whereas **(не)искоуцьнъ** 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. ἄδοκιμος); *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského...* (s.v. искоуцьнъ).

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. съмгыслъ н слово⁴³, L12 оумъ н мгыслъ;

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

*δεικνύναι – Š. съказати н наоуѣати⁴⁵, ἐξηγεῖσθαι *V.Ch.* оуѣа съказати⁴⁶, ἐντίθημι – L12 наоуѣити н наказати;

ἐπιθυμεῖν – *V.Ch.* желати н хотѣти, жьдѣти хотѣ, жадѣти н хотѣти⁴⁷, S22 желѣти н жадати (ἐπιθυμία – желаннѣ сановѣноѣ н жаданнѣ);

πρόνοια – *V.Ch.* промгыслъ н строн, L40 промгыслъ н строн, L41 пеналя н проудъ, cf. проноεῖν – *V.Ch.* пещи 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 радоданнѣ н на слажъша, cf. Ps 34, 9 *exultare et delectari*, *Ps. Sin.* възрадовати сѣ, насладнѣти сѣ (LXX ἀγαλλιάσεται, τερφθήσεται), and Ps 67, 4 *epulari et exultare et delectari*, *Ps. Sin.* възвеселити сѣ, възрадовати

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.

сѧ, наслѧднѧтѧ сѧ (LXX εὐφρανθήτωσαν, ἀγαλλιάσθωσαν, τερφθήτωσαν)⁵¹ – L86 ἡδονή сѧстѧ н радостѧ;

Bes. praedicare казѧтѧ н оуѧнѧтѧ, cf. Ps 93, 12 *erudire et docere, Ps. Sin.* наказаѧтѧ, наоуѧнѧтѧ (LXX παιδείσης, διδάξης)⁵² – L12 ἐντίθημι наоуѧнѧтѧ н наказаѧтѧ (the same in *Ḑ.* and *V.Ch.*, see above).

These examples support the idea, that double translations are of different origins, some of them are phraseological expressions which circulated between multiple texts, while others are unique and serve as distinctive stylistic features.

Chrysostom's commentaries on *Acts* are not the only texts in *Zlatostruy* with double translations. Some of the attested examples in the other homilies are the following: L2 ἀσινής сѧдрѧвѧ н бєзѧ вѧрѧдѧ, εἰδωλομανής κουμνηρѧ н ненептовѧ-сѧтѧоуѧ, τὸν νόμον πληροῦντες законеѧ влюдѧщѧ н сѧконеѧуаваижѧше н; L3 ἀφόρητος λιπѧтѧ н зѧлѧтѧ, βασιλεία ρѧн н цѧсарѧсѧтѧво, ἐπήρεια οβαждєннѧ н напастѧ, παρακαλέω мола н оуѧѧшаѧѧ, συλλογίζομαι прѧглаголаѧтѧ, прѧмѧислѧнѧтѧ, φέρω прѧсѧтѧрѧпѧѧтѧ н понєстѧ; L4 διαβάλλω ποχοуѧиѧтѧ н (по)пѧзаѧтѧ⁵³, τιμή ѧсѧтѧ н сѧнѧтѧ; L6 αίρετικός зѧловѧрѧнѧн ѧрєтнѧкѧ⁵⁴, ἄλογος вєслοвєсѧнѧн сѧотѧтѧ, κεραυνός грѧмѧтѧ н трѧскѧннѧ; L7 εὐτελής ρѧдѧннѧкѧ н сѧрѧдѧтѧ, πεπλανημένος прѧѧѧѧнѧтѧ н плаваѧѧ, χαλκοτύπος коузнѧцѧ н крѧѧннѧ⁵⁵; L9 γεωργός зємлєдѧѧ-тєлѧ н пѧсѧоуѧѧтѧ; L11 τοῦ παραδείσου ἡ τρυφή ποροдѧнѧн ρѧн; L21 ἐντρέπομαι сѧмѧиѧтѧ сѧ н сѧѧѧдѧѧтѧ сѧ, κρίνομαι ρѧзоуѧѧѧѧтѧ сѧ н ρѧсѧждѧтѧ; L33 ἐκὼν лювоѧѧѧ н хоѧѧннѧѧѧ; L35 δίκη отѧсѧждєннѧ н казнѧ, ὠφελέω пользѧѧ сѧтѧворнѧтѧ н оуѧѧѧѧ; L37 καρῆβαρία пѧжѧкоглаѧннѧ ρєкѧѧше шоуѧѧнѧсѧтѧ⁵⁶. Without a thorough study, it is impossible to determine the origin of each double translation and its possible implications about the identity of the translator(s).

Conclusions

The Old Church Slavonic translations of John Chrysostom's *Commentaries on Acts*, which were included into the early 10th-century collection *Zlatostruy*, have many features in common suggesting that they were translated together, possibly by one or two translators (since some of the homilies radically deviate from the available Greek texts) in the literary circle around the Bulgarian Tsar Symeon (893–927). One of the traits they share is the frequent use of double translations. The study shows that doublets can be viewed both as a manifestation of rigorous

⁵¹ *Ibidem*, p. 601, no. 16; *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského...* (s.v. радѧннѧ).

⁵² J. REINHART, *Une figure stylistique...*, p. 601, no. 7.

⁵³ Cf. *V.Ch.* διαβάλλω ποѧзаѧтѧ ρєкѧѧше клеѧєѧтѧтѧ, E. HANSACK, *Zum Übersetzungsstil...*, p. 147, as well as S22 οἱ σκανδαλιζόμενοι ποѧзаѧѧѧнѧ н влѧзнѧѧнѧ сѧ.

⁵⁴ Cf. *V.Ch.* αίρεσις єрєсѧ ρєкѧѧше зѧловѧрѧннѧ, E. HANSACK, *Zum Übersetzungsstil...*, p. 141.

⁵⁵ Cf. L41 χαλκοτύπος зѧѧѧрѧ н крѧѧннѧ, mentioned above.

⁵⁶ Some additional examples and commentary on the extensive and interesting vocabulary of the collection see in: A. ДИМИТРѧѧ, *Златѧстѧѧѧ...*, p. 81–444.

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 – хлѣвьць или село L41
 ἀδόκιμος – неискочьньнъ и неславьньнъ S22
 αἰτία – внигы или ꙗ҃ти и отвѣщати S22
 ἀκίνδυνος – безъ бѣды и безъ казни да бы сѧ не боѧти S22
 ἀκτίνες ἡλιακαί – свѣтлове слъньца сего и лугъ S22
 ἀλγέω – жалити и болѣти L86
 ἀλογηθέω (ἀλογηθεῖς) – оумьляти и оуцрамити сѧ L88
 ἄλογον – конь или скотъ или L12
 ἄμοιρος – поганъ не приимъ дара того L102
 ἀναπίπτω – обоумрѣти (и) отънемоши L41
 ἀναπνέω – отъдъхнѣти и оуспоудити сѧ L41
 ἀνίατος – бѣда и болѣзнь L86
 ἀνίσταμαι, ἀνακτάομαι – възстати, възвестити сѧ и оукрѣпити сѧ самъ L104
 ἀπαζιώω – отмиетати и прѣвондѣти L88
 αὐθάδεια – велнynie и прѣзърѣниие (v.l. велнванниие и прѣзоръ) L41
 βασιλείος (βασιλεία) – полатъ и властеле L40 / въ полатъ къ владыкамъ S22
 βλασφημέω – ниена кыдати и хоулити S22
 δάκνω – срьдыца досаши и прѣурѣниие сътворити S22 / cf. descriptive (δάκνομαι)
 како или досажетъ срьдыца болѣзнь L102
 δεινὰ πάσχω – велнко люто приѧти и въ велнкъ бѣдъ въпастити L104
 διαλέγομαι – оуыити и бесѣдовати L86
 διανίστημι – възвоудити и възставити L41
 δόκιμος – искочьньнъ и славьньнъ S22
 ἐκκλησία – цркы рекъше съборъ L41
 ἐντίθημι – наоуыити и наказыти L12
 ἐξίστημι – възвѣстити и неспѧити (оума) L90 / (οἱ ἐξεστηκότες) оумъ погубивъи
 и напрасьно оужасѧ сѧ S22
 ἐπιθυμέω – желѣти и жадати S22
 ἐπιθυμία – желанниие сановьное и жаданниие S22
 ἐπιμέλεια – потроужденниие и прѣлежанниие L12
 ἐπιτάττω – велѣти и стротити S22
 εὐδοκιμέω – славьньнъ и искочьньнъ быти L40

- ἡδονή – сласть и радость L86
 ἦθος – нравъ и обыван S22
 ἡσυχία – како ти въсе шогунтъ бес планца L41 / велнко мльваннне ѿстъ и тнхо
 въсе L90
 θρήνος (θρήνων) – слъзьнъин плауьнъин L41
 καθарός – везъ зазора и чнстъ L86
 καλός – добръ и сладъкъ S22
 καταλίπτω – оустъпатн и оубъиватн L86
 καταφρονέω – прѣвондѣтн и невѣщи L90
 κατηγορέω – на нъ глаголатн и осждаатн L12
 каторθώ (οἱ каторθοῦντες) – добръи и прѣмъи L40
 κραυγή – клнчъ (v.l. плнщъ) и мѣтежъ L90
 κρίσις – зазнратн и сжднтн S22
 λόγος – оумъ и мысль L12
 λύω – съказатн и раздрѣшнтн L40
 μακρόθυμος – кротъкъ и трпѣливъ L90
 νόμος – оуставъ и строн / законъ и строн L12
 ξένος – ннщъ и страннъ L88
 παννυχίς – вѣстаннне и молнтва L41 / ношнж стражеитъ бога молаше S22
 παραινέω – оунтн и проущатн на добро L86
 πενθέω – жалнтн и плакатн сѧ L86
 πενία – оубожество и нищета L40
 πρόνοια – певаль и трогдъ L41 / промысль и строн L40
 προσκυνέω – кланятн сѧ и молнтн сѧ L88
 προστασία – строеннне и попененнне чаднж S22
 ῥαθυμία – лѣнность и слабость L102
 σήλω (ἐν οἴκῳ πελονηκότι, v.l. σεσηπότι)– оутъль и гннлъ L102
 σιγάω – мльватн и не вѣсѣдоватн ннъсоже S22
 σιγή – мльваннне и шогваннне L41
 σκανδαλίξειν – прѣвѣрѣннѧ творнтн и блазнъ / зъло срьдъцоу бѣитн и блазнъ
 / (οἱ σκανδαλιζόμενοι) потъжайщен и блазнѧщен сѧ S22
 σκοπέω – съмотрѣтн и влюстн L12
 σκυθρωπός – драхлъ и скръбьнъ L86
 σπουδή – тѣщаннне и вѣтѣннне S22
 στενωπός – стѣгна и дворъ L41
 συναρίζομαι – ѧстн и пнтн L102
 σφριγάω – юнъ и тоувънъ бѣитн L12
 σφῦρα – млатъ кладнео L41
 σχίζω – раздратн сѧ и раздѣлнтн L86
 σωφρονίζομαι – вѣстѣгнжтн сѧ и наказатн сѧ L90
 τέρπω – краснтн и глогмнтн L12
 τιμωρία – казнъ и мѣка S22

- DIMITROVA A., *Prevodačeski podhodi v sbornika Zlatostruj (Zlatoustovite komentari vārhu 1Kor.)*, [in:] *Kirilo-Methodievski četenija 2015. Jubileo 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.
- GULLAUMONT 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 inicijativa 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 "Homélie 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-Methodievski 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