

MARK THE CALLIGRAPHER: CLOSING THE CIRCLE

William R. VEDER, Deerfield

St Methodius and his *скорописецъ* (*VM XV*) wrote in Glagolitic, but over a millennium of dictatorship of Cyrillic has effaced most of its traces. Reconnecting the divergent and often conflicting Cyrillic versions of one and the same Glagolitic text to their origin is a task of prime importance to the history of Slavonic, which so far only Šafařík 1854 seems to have recognized. No one in the present state of Slavic studies is better equipped to take up his lead than Anica Nazor and her colleagues at the Staroslavenski institut. To her and them I submit as a point of departure the story of Mark the calligrapher in Scete in the late 4th century who, distracted by another calling, failed to finish his omega.

Of the translations that can be attributed to St Methodius, the *Scete Patericon*¹ (Systematic Collection of *Apophthegmata patrum*, CPG 5562) lends itself best to a pilot study of the task ahead: its identification with the *отъуьскъѡѡѡ кънигы* of *VM XV* leaves little, if any room for doubt,² its witnesses have not undergone the erratic recollection with Greek manuscripts, which so mars the tradition of Biblical and liturgical translations,³ and its manuscript transmission can be accurately and reliably explained: The protograph *ω*, brought to Bulgaria in 886 by the disciples of St Methodius, was copied once at Pliska (*✚*, from which depend the Preslav Glagolitic copies *αϣε*), probably no later than 887, and then taken to Ohrid (in transport losing both its beginning and its end); there it was used for transcriptions into Cyrillic until the capture of the city by Hairuddin Pasha in 1395. The Preslav Glagolitic copies were taken to Kiev in 971, where they were transcribed into Cyrillic starting in 1036; their fate was shared by the Ohrid Cyrillic transcriptions *o* and *c* (an explicating edition of the translation), but it is not yet clear, whether they arrived there together with the Glagolitic books from Preslav.

¹ This is the name by which the Systematic Collection (divided into 22 thematic chapters) is known in Slavonic; it aptly reflects the prominence in the text of the monastic centre of *Scete* in the *Wādī Natrūn* SW of Alexandria (Egypt).

² On the *отъуьскъѡѡѡ кънигы* and the attribution to St Methodius, see NIKOLOVA 1995, VEDER 2007; the latter also provides the most reliable overview of the transmission of the Slavonic translation.

³ The tradition of the *Scete Patericon* provides a single instance of recollection with a Greek MS different from the translator's exemplar in the Cyrillic hyparchetype *k*.

Below, I present *Scete Patericon 14:11*⁴ in a lineated collation of the three Glagolitic hyparchetypes **αγε** and the three Cyrillic hyparchetypes **ock** (condensing the readings of multiple witnesses into one by choosing among the available variants the most explicit spellings), as well as the six independent Cyrillic witnesses to the Glagolitic archetype **ω** (condensing into a single W⁷ the readings of W⁵⁶⁸ which differ in this apophthegm only in spelling), cf. the *stemma* in *Fig. 1*, accompanied by a brief identification of the manuscripts. I divide the text into consecutively numbered verses.

ω	α	a	A ¹	Beograd NBS Dečani 93 (12c UA)	
		a'	A ² A ³	Moskva GIM Sin. 3 (15c RU); SPb RNB Pog. 267 (14c RU)	
		γ	b	B ¹	Moskva GIM Uvar. 483 (1542 UA)
			b'	B ² B ⁴	Moskva RGB F.178 8240 (1472 RU); RGB F.310 219 (16c UA)
			b''	B ⁵	L'viv LBAN ASP 56 (16c UA)
		ε	i	I ¹	SPb RNB Tixan. 552 (16c RU)
	i'		I ²	Moskva RGB F.113 601 (15c RU)	
	o	O	Moskva GIM Čud. 318A (15–16c RU)		
	c	C ¹ C ² C ⁴	Moskva GIM Čud. 18 (14c RU); RGB F.304 703 (14c RU); NBMGU 1310 (15c RU)		
	k	K ²	SPb BAN Belokr. 2 (16c BG)		
	W ²		Beograd NBS Peć 86 (13c SR)		
	W ³		Moskva RGB Popov 93 (14c BG)		
	W ⁴		SPb RNB Hilf. 90 (14c SR)		
	W ⁵		Wien ÖNB Slav. 152 (13c BG) ⁵		
W ⁶		Beograd MSPC Krka 4 (14c BG) ⁵			
W ⁸		Paris BN Slav. 10 (14c SR) ⁵			

Fig 1: *Stemma codicum* of the *Scete Patericon 14:11*⁶

α	ГЛАХΟΥ О ОЦИ СИЛУАНЪ. АКО ИМАШЕ ОУЧЕНИКА ВЪ СКИТЪ. ИМЕНЕМЪ МАРКО.
γ	ГЛАХΟΥ О ОЦИ СИЛУАНЪ. ЯКО ИМЪАШЕ ОУЧНИКА ВЪ СКИТЪ ИМЕНЕМЪ МАРКА.
ε	ГЛАХУ О УЦИ СИЛУАННЪ. ЯКО ИМАШЕ ОУЧНИКА ВЪ СКИТЪ. ИМЕНЕМЪ МАРКА.
o	ГЛАХΟΥ W УЦИ СИЛУАНЪ ЯКО ИМЪАШЕ ОУЧНИКА ВЪ СКИТЪ ИМЕНЕМЪ МАРКА
c	ГЛАХУ О ОЦИ СИЛУАНЪ. ЯКО ИМЪАШЕ ОУЧНИКА ВЪ СКИТЪ. ИМЕНЕМЪ МАРКА.
k	ГЛАХѢ W УЦИ СИЛУАНЪ. ЯКО ИМЪАШЕ ОУЧЕНИКА ВЪ СКИТЪ. ИМЕНЕМЪ МАРКА.
W ²	ГЛАХΟΥ W УЦИ СИЛУАНЪ. ЯКО ИМЪАШЕ ОУЧЕНИКА ВЪ СКИТЪ. ИМЕНЕМЪ МАРКА.
W ³	ГЛАХѢ W ОЦИ СИЛУАНЪ. ЯКО ИМЪАШЕ ВЪ СКИТЪ ОУЧЕНИКА ИМЕНЕМЪ МАРКА.
W ⁴	ГЛАХΟΥ W УЦИ СИЛУАНЪ. ЯКО ИМЪАШЕ ОУЧЕНИКА ВЪ СКИТЪ. ИМЕНЕМЪ МАРКА
W ¹	ГЛАХѢ W ОЦИ СИЛУАНЪ. ЯКО ИМЪАШЕ ОУЧЕНИКА ВЪ СКИТЪ. ИМЕНЕМЪ МАРКА.

⁴ The inventory of the chapters is numbered by GUY 1993–2005 according to the most developed state of the text, e.g. cod. Moskva GIM Sin.gr. 452 (Russian translation: VISSARION 1874, Bulgarian: STEFANOV 1994), which in chapter 14 (*On Obedience*) has this story as nr. 11; the earlier, less developed state, preserved in the Latin and the Slavonic translation, has it as nr. 5.

⁵ W⁵ and W⁸ are edited by VAN WIJK 1975; on W⁶, cf. PILEVA 2003.

⁶ Non-Latin sigla: Glagolitic hyparchetypes; Latin sigla: Cyrillic hyparchetypes (bold) and witnesses (not bold); shaded: South Slavic; BG = Bulgarian, RU = Russian, SR = Serbian, UA = Ruthenian.

2

а бѣ же имѣа послушаніе велико. и бѣ писецъ. любаше же и старецъ. за послушаніе
 γ бѣ же имѣа послушаніе велие. и бѣ писецъ. любаше же и старецъ за послушаніе
 ε бѣ же имѣа послушаніе велие. и бѣ пици. любаше же старецъ. за послушаніе
 о бѣ же имѣа послушаніе велие и бѣ писецъ любаше же и старецъ за послушаніе
 с бѣ же имѣа и послушаніе велие и бѣ писецъ. любаше же и старецъ за послушаніе
 к бѣ во имѣа послушаніе велико. и бѣ писецъ. любаше же е старецъ. за послушаніе
 W² бѣш же ими послушаніе велие. и бѣ пици. любаше же него старецъ. за послушаніе.
 W³ и бѣше и писецъ. и любаше его старецъ. за послушаніе
 W⁴ бѣ же имѣе послушаніе велие. и бѣ писецъ. и любаше же и старецъ за послушаніе
 W¹ бѣ же имѣа послушаніе велие. и бѣ пици. любаше же и старецъ за послушаніе

3

а его. имѣаше же и дровгыа. і. оученикъ ти единого. и скорбааху ако любаше
 γ его. имаше же и дровгыныхъ. і. оученикъ. и скорбааху. ако любаше
 ε его. имаше же и дровгыныхъ оученикъ число^м. і. ти. единого сего марка. его* любаше
 о его. имаше же и дровгыныхъ і. оученикъ и скорбааху ако любаше
 с него. имѣаше инѣхъ. і. оученикъ и единого. и скорбааху ако любашетъ
 к его имѣше же и дровгыхъ. і. оученикъ. и скръвѣхъ ако того единого любаше
 W² имѣаше и дровгыне. ді. оученикъ и скръвѣхъ. ако любаше
 W³ ^{сн} имѣше же. и дровгыхъ. і. оученикъ. скръвѣхъ же дрѣси оученици его. ако любаше
 W⁴ него. имѣаше же и дровгыныхъ. і. оученикъ. и единого. и скръвѣаху зане любаше
 W¹ него. имѣше же и дровгыныхъ. і. оученикъ. и скръвѣхъ. ако любаше

4

а	и. паче всѣхъ.	и слышавше скръвѣаху старци.
γ	и паче всѣхъ.	и слышавше ѿбо старци скорбаахъ.
ε	паче всѣхъ. и прочии скорбааху зане его любаше.	слышавше старци и скръвѣахъ.
о	и паче всѣхъ	и слышавше старци скорбааху.
с	и паче всѣхъ.	и слышавше старци скорбааху.
к	паче всѣхъ.	и слышавше старци скръвѣхъ о вещи.
W ²	него паче внѣхъ.	и слышавше старци скръвѣаху.
W ³	марка паче всѣхъ.	слышав же старецъ скръвѣ ихъ.
W ⁴	сего паче внѣхъ.	и слышавше старци скръвѣаху.
W ¹	и паче всѣхъ.	и слышавше старци скръвѣхъ.

5

а придоша же единою къ нему старци. поимъ же ѿ изиде. и тѣакну въ вса келія.
 γ придоша же единою к нему старци. поимъ ѿ изиде. и толькнѣ. въ вса хижѣ.
 ε единою же и придоша к нему старци. поимъ ѿ изиде. и толькнѣ въ вса хижѣ.
 о придоша же единою к нему старци. и поимъ ѿ изиде и толькнѣ въ вса хижѣ
 с придоша же единою к нему старци. и поимъ ѿ изиде. и толькнѣ во всѣхъ хижѣхъ
 к придошъ же единою старци къ нему. и поемъ ѿ изиде. " тѣакнѣ въ всѣхъ келіахъ
 W² придошъ же единою к нему старци. и поемъ ѿ изиде. и толькнѣ въ все хижѣ.
 W³ вънегда же придоша къ нему братіа. поемъ же ихъ старецъ. и изиде. и въбиде въсѣмъ
 оученикомъ своимъ келіа тѣакнѣ.
 W⁴ Придошъ же единою старци к нему. и поемъ ѿ изиде и толькнѣ въ все хижѣ
 W¹ придошъ же единою старци к нему. и поемъ ѿ изиде. и толькнѣ въ вса хижѣ

6

а	гѣа	онъ брате именемъ рекъ. приди ако тревѣ ми еси.	и не изиде емѣ
γ	гѣа	онъ брате. именемъ рекъ. приди. ако тревѣ ми еси.	и не послѣдова емѣ
ε	гѣа	онъ брате приди ако потребенъ ми еси.	и не послѣдова емѣ
о	гѣа.	онъ брате именемъ рекъ. приди ако тревѣ ми еси.	и не послѣдова емѣ
с	гѣа.	онъ брате именемъ рекъ. приди ако тревѣ ми еси.	и не послѣдѣствовѣа емѣ

7

⁷ Here, the witness W⁵ breaks off, owing to a loss of leaves.

к гл̃а. онъ брѣть имене^м рекѣ. прииди ѿко трѣбѣ еси. и не послѣдова
 W² ѿн же гл̃е именем^ь рекѣ прииди ѿко трѣбѣ ми еси. и единый ѿ ни^х
 W³ и гл̃аше. ѿнъ сица брате. има рекѣ. изыди. ѿко трѣбѣ ми еси. и не послѣдѣствовоа емоу.
 W⁴ гл̃е. ѿнъ брате именем^ь рекѣи гредѣи зане трѣбѣ мы еси. и не послѣдова емоу
 W¹ гл̃а. ѿнъ брате именем^ь рекѣ. прииди. ѿко трѣбѣ ми еси. и не послѣдѣствовоа емоу

8

а ниединъже отъ ни^х. приде же къ келии марковѣ. и тлъкноу въз ню гл̃а
 γ ниединъ ѿ ни^х. приде же абіе къ хыже марковѣ. и толкнѣ въз ню гл̃а.
 ε ниединъ ѿ ни^х. приде же абіе къ хыжи марковѣ. и тлъкнѣ въз ню гл̃а.
 о ниединъ ѿ ни^х. приде же абіе къ хыжи марковѣ. и толкнѣ въз ню гл̃а.
 с ниединъ ѿ ни^х. приде же абіе къ хыжи марковѣ. и толкнѣ въз ню гл̃а.
 к ниединъ ѿ ни^х. приде же абіе и къ марковѣ келии и тлъкнѣ въз гл̃а.
 W² не послѣдова емоу. абіе приде къ къ хыжи марковѣ. и тлъкнѣ воз него въз дѣври гл̃е
 W³ ниединъ ѿ ни^х. приде же и до келиѣ марковѣ. и тлъкнѣ въз гл̃а.
 W⁴ ниединъ ѿ ни^х. приде же и къ хыжи марковѣ. и тлъкнѣ въз въз ню гл̃е
 W¹ ниединъ ѿ ни^х. прише же абіе и къ хыжи марковѣ. и тлъкнѣ въз же гл̃а

9 10

а марѣе. онъ же слышавъ гл̃а старьца. и абіе искоуи възнъ. и пѣсти и на слѣжѣву.
 γ марѣо онъ же слышавъ гл̃а старецѣ. абіе искоуи възнъ. и посла и на слѣжѣву.
 ε онъ же абіе слыша гл̃а старцевѣ. искоуи възнъ. и посла его на слѣжѣву.
 о марѣо. ѿнъ же слышавъ гл̃а старца. абіе искоуи възнъ. и посла и на слѣжѣву.
 с марѣе. онъ же гл̃а слышавъ старьца. абіе искоуи възнъ. и посла и абіе на слѣжѣву.
 к марѣе онъ же слышавъ гл̃а старьца. абіе искоуи възнъ. посла его на слѣжѣву.
 W² марѣе. ѿнъ же слышавъ гл̃а старьца. абіе искоуи възнъ. абіе излѣже възнъ. и посла него на слѣжѣву.
 W³ марѣе. ѿнъ же слышавъ гл̃а старцевѣ. и абіе искоуи възнъ. и посла его на слѣжѣву.
 W⁴ марѣе. ѿнъ же слышавъ гл̃а старьца. абіе искоуи възнъ. и посла и на слѣжѣву
 W¹ марѣе. ѿнъ же слышавъ гл̃а старьца. абіе искоуи възнъ. и посла и на слѣжѣву.

11

12

а гл̃а же старьцемъ къде съть дръгаа братиа оци. възлѣже же въз келию его.
 γ гл̃а же старьцемъ. къде съть прочаѣ братиа оци възлѣже же въз хыжу его.
 ε гл̃а же старьцемъ. гдѣ съть прочаѣ братиа оци. възлѣже же въз хыжу его.
 о гл̃а же старьцемъ. къде съть прочаѣ братиа ѿци. възлѣже въз хыжу его.
 с гл̃а же старьцемъ. гдѣ съть прочии братиа оци. възлѣже въз хыжу его.
 к гл̃а же старьцемъ. гдѣ съть ѿци. прочаѣ братиа. възлѣже въз келию его
 W² и гл̃а старьцемъ. гдѣ съть прочаѣ братиа ѿци. и възлѣже въз хыжу его.
 W³ и гл̃а къ старьцемъ. гдѣ съть прочаѣ братиа. и възлѣжѣ ѿци въз келиѣ марковѣ.
 W⁴ гл̃а же старьцемъ. гдѣ съть прочаѣ братиа ѿци. възлѣже въз хыжу его.
 W¹ гл̃а же старьцемъ. гдѣ съть прочаѣ братиа ѿци. възлѣже въз хыжу его.

13

а поиска тетради. и обрѣте ѿко писаше ѿ оуслышавъ же
 γ поиска тетради его. и обрѣте и ѿко ѿнъ писаше. и слышавъ
 ε поискаше тетради его. и обрѣтоша же ѿко писаше.⁸ ѿко оуслыша гл̃а
 о поиска тетради его и обрѣте ѿко писаше ѿнъ.⁸ и слышавъ
 с и поиска тетради него. и обрѣте и писавша.⁸ и ѿко оуслыша
 к поиска. тетради его. и обрѣте ѿко писаше. и слышавъ
 W² поиска тетради него. и обрѣте ѿко писаше. и слышавъ
 W³ и поискашѣ тетради его. и обрѣтошѣ ѿци. ѿко възлѣже писашѣ ѿ. да егда слыша гл̃а
 W⁴ поиска дѣло его и обрѣте ѿко писаше ѿ.⁸ и слышавъ
 W¹ поиска тетради него. и обрѣте ѿко писаше. и слышавъ

а старьца. не обрати трѣстию. да бы съконьчаль ю.
 γ старца не обрати трѣсти. да бы сконьчаль е.

⁸ Note the misreading of Glagolitic *d* as *t* (тетради → тетради) and *t* as *d* (тетради → дѣло).

ε старѣчь. не обрати трости да бы сконѣалъ е.
 о старца не вбрати трости. да бы сконѣалъ е.
 с старца. и не обрати трости оконѣати слова но изъ скочи вонъ.
 к старѣца не вбрати трѣсть. да бы сконѣаль слово еже писѣваше. сице бѣ слово ѡ. до
 W² старѣца. не вбрати трѣсти въ сконѣаниѣ.
 W³ старѣвъ. к томѣ трѣста не вбрати. да сконѣбеть слово.
 W⁴ старѣца не вбрати трѣсти да бы сконѣаль ѣ.
 W¹ старѣца. не вбрати трѣсти да би сконѣаль ѣ⁹.

14

α	и рѣша старѣци.	въ истинѣ егоже любимиши тѣи оѣе. и мзи того любимъ
γ	рѣша же старѣци	въ истинѣ егоже ты любимиши ѡѣе. и мы любимъ
ε	рѣша же старѣци.	во истинѣ его ты любимиши оѣе. и мы любимъ.
ο	рѣша же старѣци.	во истинѣ егоже ты любимиши ѡѣе. и мы любимъ.
с	и рѣша старѣци.	во истинѣ любимиши ѣго оѣе. и мзи любимъ.
к	полы. и рѣшѣ старѣци.	въ истинѣ егоже ты любимиши ѡѣе. и мы любимъ его.
W ²	глаголютъ же старѣци.	въ истинѣ егоже ты любимиши. авѣа. и ми любимъ.
W ³	рѣшѣ же емоу старѣци.	въ истинѣ ѡѣе. егоже любимишъ. и мы въси любимъ его.
W ⁴	рѣше же старѣци.	въ истинѣ ѣгоже ты любимиши ѡѣе. и мы и любимъ.
W ¹	рѣшѣ же старѣци.	въ истинѣ ѣгоже ты любимиши ѡѣе. и мы любимъ и.

α и бѣ того любить.
 γ ѣко бѣ любить и.
 ε ѣко и бѣ любить его.
 ο ѣко бѣ любить его.
 с ѣко и бѣ любить ѣго.
 к ѣко и бѣ любитъ того же дѣлатель е.
 W² ѣко бѣ любитъ ѣго.
 W³ ѣко бѣ любитъ его.
 W⁴ знѣ бѣ любить и.
 W¹ ѣко бѣ любить ѣго.

The next step is to separate what is individual in the witnesses from what they received of St Method's original translation ω (or its Glagolitic copy Ѡ). This choice involves establishing the probabilities of change from a primary to a secondary state of the text (i.e. answering the question *utrum in alterum abiturum erat?*). The limits of probability can be established by reference to the Greek version, edited by Guy 1993–2005 (square brackets mark variant readings in the edition of Cotelier 1677¹⁰ which more closely correspond to the Latin and Slavonic), complemented with the Latin version of before AD 560, edited by Rosweyde 1628.¹¹ This is what such a *textus receptus* should look like in Cyrillic:¹²

⁹ Here, W⁸ replaces ѣ → слово.

¹⁰ COTELIER 1677 edited the alphabetic part of the Alphabetic–Anonymous Collection of *Apophthegmata patrum* (CPG 5560–5561), the source of the Systematic collection. In Cotelier's edition, the story is identified as *Marcus 1*, indicating its place in the dossier *M sub Marcus*; the modern standard (RÉGNAULT 1976) is to identify it as 526, by its place in the entire alphabetic–anonymous collection (1–948 edited by COTELIER 1677; 949–1001 edited by GUY 1962; 1002–1765, partially edited by NAU 1905–1913).

¹¹ Note that the Latin version, despite its antiquity and the fact that its translators both attained the rank of *pontifex maximus*, is by no means beyond reproach: it is erroneous (12), explicative (10) and otherwise verbose (2 4 5 13). Similar *lapsus* mark the performance of the Slavonic witnesses **k** and W³.

¹² Leaving aside all abbreviations and standardising all spellings to maximal discreteness.

1

Ἔλεγον περὶ τοῦ ἀββᾶ Σιλουανοῦ, ὅτι εἶχεν ἐν Σκήτει μαθητὴν, ὀνόματι Μάρκον·

Dicebant de abbate Silvano, quod habuerit in Scythi discipulum, nomine Marcum, Γλαγολααχϣ ο οτѣци силоганѣ· іако имѣаше вѣ скитѣ оу҃ченика именимъ марѣко.¹³

2

ἦν δὲ ἔχων ὑπακοὴν μεγάλην, καὶ ἦν καλλιγράφος. Ἠγάπα δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ γέρων διὰ τὴν ὑπακοὴν αὐτοῦ.

et hic fuerit magnæ obedientiæ, quique etiam scriptor antiquarius erat. Diligebat autem eum senex propter obedientiam suam.

вѣ же имѣи¹⁴ послоушание велие· и вѣ писѣуни¹⁵ любаѣаше же и старѣць за послоушание его·

3

Εἶχε δὲ καὶ ἄλλους ἕνδεκα μαθητάς, καὶ ἐθλίβοντο ὅτι ἠγάπα αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ αὐτούς.

Habebat enim alios undecim discipulos, qui contristabantur quod diligebat eum plus eis.

имѣаше же и двоу҃гъна¹⁶ ї¹⁷ оу҃ченикѣ ти¹⁸ ієдино҃го· и скрѣвѣахϣ· іако любаѣаше и¹⁹ па҃че онѣхѣ²⁰.

4

Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ γέροντες [ἐλυπήθησαν].

Quod cum audissent vicini senes, quia senex plus eum cæteris diligebat, moleste tulerunt.

и слѣшавѣше старѣци· скрѣвѣахϣ·

¹³ The replacement *NA* марѣко → *AG* марѣка has a greater probability than the inverse.

¹⁴ The replacement имѣи → имѣа has a greater probability than the inverse.

¹⁵ The replacement писѣуни → писѣць has a greater probability than the inverse; cf also the hybrid forms пицини (*W*⁵⁶⁸) and пицини (*ε*). The word occurs once more, in the *D* писѣѣви (*B*:22, *αγ* unanimously; Greek unidentified). Could this be a hybrid form to писѣѣви? Or must we assume the translator to have used both писѣуни and писѣць? Whatever the answer, the second occurrence obviates speculation that писѣуни and писѣць might be independent replacements of a grecism used by the translator.

¹⁶ The replacement *A* двоу҃гъна → *AG* двоу҃гънихѣ (and hence → онѣхѣ) has a greater probability than the inverse.

¹⁷ Here, *W*⁵ retains the first two letters *дѣ* of the numeral written in full; it is not impossible that the verbal expression is authentic.

¹⁸ The replacement ти → и and → о (*γokW*²³⁵⁶⁸) has a greater probability than the inverse.

¹⁹ The replacement *NA* и → *AG* ієго (and hence → сего and → того єдино҃го) has a greater probability than the inverse.

²⁰ After па҃че, the replacement онѣхѣ → вѣхѣхѣ has a greater probability than the inverse.

ὅτι [Ω ἔβαλε χεῖρα ποιεῖν]

Et ingressus est in cellam Marci, et invenit quaternionem, quem eadem hora inchoaverat, in quo litteram O faciebat.

ВЪЛЪЗЪ ЖЕ ВЪ ХЪИЖЪ КЕГО· ПОИСКА ТЕТРАДИ КЕГО· И ОБРЪТЕ· ІАКО ПИСАДШЕ W²⁷

13

καὶ ἀκούσας [τοῦ γέροντος], οὐκ ἔστρεψε τὸν κάλαμον τοῦ πληρῶσαι αὐτό. Λέγουσιν οὖν οἱ γέροντες·

Et audita voce senis, non fixit, nec gyrauit calamum ultra, ut impleret et claudet litteram quam in manus habebat. Et dixerunt senes:

И СЛЪИШАВЪ СТАРЬЦА· НЕ ОБРАТИ ТРЪСТИ· ДА БИ СЪКОНЫАЛЪ КЕ²⁸ РЪША ЖЕ СТАРЬЦИ·

14

Ὅντως ὄν σὺ ἀγαπᾷς, ἀββᾶ, καὶ ἡμεῖς [αὐτὸν] ἀγαπῶμεν, ὅτι καὶ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ἀγαπᾷ.

Vere, abba, quem tu diligis, et nos diligimus quoniam et Deus diligit eum.

ВЪ ИСТИНѦ· КЕГОЖЕ ТЪИ ЛЮБИШИ· ДЪЗВА²⁹ И МЪИ И ЛЮБИМЪ· ІАКО И БОГЪ ЛЮБИТЪ И·

The *textus receptus* shows internal morphological and lexical discrepancies. These testify to the fact that the original translation underwent change already at the hands of the makers of the hyparchetypes, which are of two kinds: the innovating Glagolitic **Ѡ** (and **α-ε**) and the conservative Cyrillic **o**-W⁸; among them are two compilations, **β**³⁰ and **ε**³¹. The discrepancies must be dealt with before proceeding to the *textus reconstructus* **ω**.

(1) The most sweeping change is the replacement, in animated *m* nouns and pronouns, of *AN* → *AG*. The Cyrillic hyparchetype **k** and the witnesses W²³ have generalised the *G*; **o** and **c** preserve *A* only in *и* (2 3 10) and *ѡ* (5); in 14, following *кегоже*, even **α**, which generally preserves the most *AN* forms, succumbs to the pressure of the *G*. This process must have affected all hyparchetypes, because there is no trace left of *AN* in *оу҃ченика* (1), *ѡдино҃го* (3) and *кегоже* (14). In 13, *гласъ старьъ* (**ε**W³) could be an expansion of original *старьць*, but it could just

²⁷ The expansion *w* → *whz* (and hence its omission) has a greater probability than the inverse.

²⁸ Like the Latin translators before them, **ck**W³⁸ chose to explicate *ie*, i.e. with *слово*. The array of witnesses suggests that the use of *слово* to designate a *littera* in the initial phase of Slavonic text transmission may have had a wider currency than Croatian and Serbian alone (cf. also its use for *στοιχεῖον* in the translation **Θ** *γραμματικῆς* from the *scholia* to Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Ars grammatica*, ed. VEDER 2005: 396–408, who short-sightedly labels it a 'Western Balkan accent').

²⁹ The replacement *дъзва* → *отъве* has a greater probability than the inverse.

³⁰ The Glagolitic hyparchetype **β**, a compilation also known as the *Scaliger Patericon* (cf. VEDER 2005: 111–112), omits 14:11 and is therefore not included in the *stemma* above.

³¹ The Glagolitic hyparchetype **ε**, a compilation also known as the *Tixanov Patericon*, is described in detail in VEDER 2005: 248–256.

as well be a simple repetition from 10; in the latter case, *εταρϋца* would be a fourth unanimous *G* reading of the hyparchetypes.

- (2) For indeclinable *ἀββῶ* we read *L* *отъци* (1) and *V* *авъва* (14). Indeclinable Slavonic *авъва* is elsewhere in the *Scete Patericon* best preserved in the *NV*, but in the oblique cases it either integrated into the *A*-declension (so most prominently **β**), or replaced → *отъць* (most prominently **αγ**) or → *εταρϋць* (most prominently **с**). In 1, we are obviously confronted with a rare case of unanimity among the hyparchetypes in replacing the *L* *авъва* → *отъци*, unlike in 14, where at least *W*³ has preserved the *V* *авъва*.

The latter shows that we cannot proceed without checking our findings against comparable data in the rest of the *Scete Patericon*, watching especially for *recessive* forms, i.e. those vulnerable forms in the translator's text, which had little currency beyond the area of the original mission and were therefore most widely affected by the interference of the earliest copyists (as 3–6 below show, they are best preserved in the second half of the contents, where the urge to change unfamiliar items gave way to the urge to finish the copy).

- (3) The name *Mark* (1 9) is preserved in the *NA* *μαρζκζ* in 10:9 (*W*²), 14:12 (*W*²), 17:6 (*W*⁴) and 18:20 (**ο**). A development *μαρζκo* → *μαρζκζ* is unlikely, especially in view of the various misidentifications as *μακαριни*, so we must consider both *NA* *μαρζκo* and *AG* *μαρ'κα* (1) as various replacements for the translator's *μαρζκζ*. The *V* *μαρζκε* (9) cannot be imputed to the Serbian witness *W*⁴, for this would imply its having replaced the correct *μαρζϋε*; as the miscorrection to *N* *μαρ'κο* (**γo**) and the omission (**ε**) show, the *V* *μαρζϋε* is more probably just one of three different solutions, applied already in the very first phase of transmission, to the *crux* of the translator's grecism *V* *μαρζκε*.
- (4) For *κέλλα* and *κελλιον* (5 8 12), *χζιζζ* is preserved in 1:68 (**αγ**), 16:28 (**αB**¹), 18:37 (**αB**¹) and 20:4 (**ο**). A development *φχζιζκa* → *m* *χζιζζ* is as unlikely as a development *κελινα* → *χζιζκa*, so we must consider both *φχζιζκa* and *κελινα* here as various replacements for the translator's *m* *χζιζζ*. The adjective *μαρζκoвѣ*, which follows in 8, forms no obstacle: it agrees not only with the *D* *χζιζки*, but just as well with the *L* *χζιζѣ*, and it is the latter form (*recessive*, because governed by the verbal prefix *при-*) which I propose to reconstruct here, eliminating the preposition *κζ* and reading *вζ нѣ* as *вζ нь*.
- (5) For *ἀδελφός* (6 11), the *r*-stem *βρατρ-* is preserved in 4:1 (*W*⁵), 10:2 (*W*⁵), 20:13 (*W*⁵) and 22:17 (*W*⁵⁶).³² An augment *βρατ-* → *βρατρ-* is less likely than a syncope *βρατρ-* → *βρατ-*, so we must consider *βρατε* and *βρατνια* here as

³² The *r*-stem is also preserved in adjectival forms, cf. VAN WIJK 1975: 81 (= *W*⁵⁸).

A *textus reconstructus* of this type, to my mind, offers more plausible explanations for the fundamental divergences in the Cyrillic witnesses than any reference to scribal freedom and fallibility can. Still it remains to be agreed which additional adjustments are required in order convincingly to close the circle from diversity to unity.

LITERATURE

- COTELIER, Jean-Baptiste, 1677. *Ecclesiae graecae monumenta...*, 1. [Paris], repr. in: Jacques-Paul Migne (ed.) *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca*, 65: 75–440.
- CPG 1974–1987, 1998. Maurice Geerard (ed.) *Clavis Patrum Graecorum, 1–5 + Supplementum*. Turnhout, 5–33.
- GUY, Jean-Claude, 1993–2005. *Les Apophthègmes des Pères, Collection systématique, chapitres 1–9*. Paris (Sources chrétiennes 387); id. 10–16. Paris (Sources chrétiennes 474); id. 17–21. Paris (Sources chrétiennes 498).
- MARTI, Roland W., 1999. Abecedaria – A Key to the Original Slavic Alphabet. Antonios-Emilios Tachiaos et al. (eds.) *Thessaloniki – Magna Moravia*. Thessaloniki, 175–200.
- MIKLAS, Heinz, 2003. Jesus-Abbreuiatur und Verwandtes: Zu einigen Rätseln der glagolitischen Schriftentwicklung am Material der Azbučnaja molitva. Wim Honselaar et al. (eds.) *Time Flies. Festschrift for William Veder*. Amsterdam (Pegasus Oost-Europese Studies, 2), 171–204.
- NAU, François, 1905. Le chapitre Περὶ ἀναχωρητῶν ἁγίων et les sources de la vie de St. Paul de Thèbes. *Revue de l'orient chrétien* 10: 387–417.
- NAU, François, 1907–1913. Histoires des solitaires égyptiens. *Revue de l'orient chrétien* 12(1907): 43–69, 171–193, 393–413; 13(1908): 47–66, 266–297; 14(1909): 357–379; 17(1912): 204–211, 294–301; 18(1913): 137–144.
- NIKOLOVA, Svetlina, 1995. Otečeski knigi. Petăr Dinekov et al. (eds.) *Kirilo-Metodievska enciklopedija 2.*, Sofia, 886–891.
- PILEVA, Stefka, 2003. *An Important Witness to Old Slavic Monastic Miscellanies: Krka 4 (1346)*. Budapest: CEU (Diss.).
- RÉGNAULT, Dom Lucien, 1976. *Les sentences des pères du désert*. Troisième recueil et tables. Solesmes.
- ROSWEYDE, Heribert, 1628. *Vitæ Patrum. De vita et verbis seniorum libri x...* Antwerpen (1st ed. 1615); *Libri v–vi* repr. Jacques-Paul Migne (ed.) *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina*, 73: 855–1022.
- ŠAFARÍK, Pavel J., 1854. *Über den Ursprung und die Heimat des Glagolitismus*. Praha.

- STEFANOV, ieromonax Pavel, 1994. *Dreven paterik ili duxovnata mǎdrost na otcite na pustinjata*. Sofia.
- VAN WIJK, Nicolaas, 1975. *The Old Church Slavic Translation of the Ἀνδρῶν ὀρίων βίβλος*. The Hague.
- VEDER [Feder], William R., 2005. *Hiljada godini kato edin den. Životāt na tekstovete v Pravoslavnoto slavjanstvo*. Sofia.
- VEDER William R., 2007. Metodievata zla hiena. *Kirilo–Metodievski studii 17*, forthcoming.
- VEDER William R., The Glagolitic Barrier. *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 34*, forthcoming.
- [VISSARION, episkop], 1874. *Drevnij paterik, izložennyj po glavam*. Moskva (2nd ed. 1891).

S u m m a r y

Apophthegm 14:11 of the Scete Patericon serves as a basis for discussing concrete problems of reconstructing a text written in the earliest form of the Glagolitic alphabet.

Key words: Apophthegmata Patrum, Glagolitic alphabet, St Methodius, text reconstruction

S a Ź e t a k

KRASOPISAC MARKO: ZATVARANJE KRUGA

Mudra izreka 14,11 *Skitskoga paterika* služi kao osnova za raspravu o konkretnim problemima rekonstrukcije teksta koji je zapisan najstarijim oblikom glagoljice.

Ključne riječi: Apophthegmata Patrum, glagoljica, sv. Metod, rekonstrukcija teksta

Izvorni znanstveni članak

*Autor: William R. Veder
Deerfield, IL*