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ABSTRACT

The current research focuses on semantic and pragmatic factors involved in the lexical variation in medieval translations. It is the first cross-linguistic and cross-cultural study of the different paths of semantic signification taken by the medieval Slavic translators of a Byzantine text. Therefore, it fills a gap in the field of Slavonic translation studies where semantic and pragmatic analysis of the factors of lexical variation have previously not been primary objects of study.

The data for the investigation were drawn from a Slavonic translation, probably dating to the 14th-century, of an 11th-century Greek text entitled ‘Triadic Hymn with Midnight Prayer from the Dogmatics of the Holy Dionysius the Areopagite. Compilation and Composition of the Monk Thekara.’ This text, which has not been studied previously, comprises Lenten hymns and prayers for daily monastic use, based on the theology of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. I examine two Slavonic versions – one attested in ten manuscripts held in Hilandar Monastery on Mount Athos, the Czech National Museum in Prague, and the Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church in Belgrade; and the other in a single codex from the Holy Trinity Monastery near Pljevlja, Montenegro.

In the dissertation I approach the lexical variation in the Slavonic translation of the Thekara inductively, as a manifestation of the heterogenous nature of the semantic
organization of the lexicon. Thus, I use approaches from different theoretical frameworks to interpret the data – componential analysis, lexical fields, frame-semantics, Gricean inferential analysis, and the cognitive linguistic approach to imagery. This integrative methodology is partly based on the non-unified model of lexical semantics proposed by P. Violi. The analysis of the data in these terms provides a model of best practices for approaching lexical semantics in medieval translations.

The study suggests that the lexical variation in the Slavonic translation of the *Thekara* in its greater part is based on foregrounding mechanisms, i.e., the bringing into focus of specific semantic features, metaphorical associations and socio-cultural concepts. The study proposes that such foregrounding cannot be analyzed solely on the referential level of semantics but must include reference to the perceptual and axiological (evaluative) dimensions of meaning.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

_The same things expressed in Hebrew do not have an equal force when translated in another language._

Prologue of Jesus, the son of Sirach, 130 B.C.¹

1. Scope and objectives of the study

This research started with a text, and in particular, with a medieval text – a Slavic translation of a Greek monastic compilation done by a monk, called Thekara, and based on the theology and philosophy of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. The compilation is also referred to in the scholarly literature as the _Thekara Book_ or just _Thekara_, which is a metonymic relation between the name of the author and his text. In my study, I will use the same designation and will refer to the text as the _Thekara_.

The idea that this text was little known in the field and had never been studied before was quite enticing and offered the promise of various directions of research.

When I first started collecting Greek and Slavic manuscripts of the text, I was certain that I was undertaking a purely philological task - to establish the textual tradition

---

¹ Brenton 1995: iii.
of the Slavonic translation of the *Thekara*. However, in the course of my preliminary observations on the Slavonic translation, it became clear that there were significant lexical differences between one of the Slavonic manuscripts and the rest of them. The collation of the Slavonic manuscripts of the *Thekara* presented various kinds of lexical variation in the translation of the Greek vocabulary.

The existence of lexical variation is a common characteristic of any natural language. Problems of lexical variation are commonly discussed by linguists under the rubric of lexical semantics. Adrienne Lehrer, for example, defines the objectives of such research by referring to the general observation that “speakers do not always mean exactly the same things with the same words but there is a common range of shared meaning.” Thus, the goal of the investigator is “to discover the kind and extent of variation” (Lehrer 1974: 6).

This study is about lexical variation in medieval Slavonic, but unlike other studies on lexical variation, which focus on one language (Geeraerts, Grodelaers, and Bakema 1994), I will look at the lexical variation in one language (Slavonic) as a response to another (Greek) through translation equivalents. Therefore, the goal of this dissertation is to provide semantic and pragmatic analysis of one particular phenomenon of semantic signification – lexical variation in two versions of the same translation.

In my study I raise two fundamental questions related to our understanding of lexical variation:

1) WHY is the lexical variation possible? In other words, what motivates different translations of one and the same lexical item? Motivation here refers both to internal
linguistic relations (paradigmatic and syntagmatic) and external ones (language-conceptualization, in general).

2) HOW is the lexical variation possible? This question refers to the mechanisms of translation that lead to the differentiation in meaning observable in lexical variations.

Related to both questions is the concept of “lexical choice.” Based on his initial motivation to translate one and the same word with different lexical items, the translator makes his lexical choice, which is determined by the availability of lexical, grammatical, and pragmatic means in his native language. The very existence of lexical variation in translations should not be treated as a result of the mechanical application of a “hit list” of words on the part of the translator or editor; rather, it is viewed in this study as a result of procedures (or mechanisms) rooted in referential, perceptual, socio-cultural, and axiological (evaluative) dimensions of semantic signification.  

Therefore, this is first and foremost a cross-linguistic and cross-cultural study of the different paths of semantic signification as taken by the Slavic translators or editors of the *Thekara*. I do not simply describe the transfers of “meaning” from one language to another but analyze the mechanisms for conveying this meaning. The quintessential problem any translation study poses to the researcher is to determine how is it possible for two languages to communicate the same or similar meaning in particular contexts despite the differences in their grammatical and semantic structures and, moreover, despite the differences in the cultures where these languages exist.

---

2 This comparison was suggested by Daniel E. Collins in private communication.

3 I discuss these terms in detail in Chapter 2.
Analyzing the translatability of words from one language to another inevitably involves drawing on various approaches to lexical semantics. My dissertation is not an exception. However, there is one substantial difference in my approach; I do not adopt a single theoretical framework, into which I “fit” my data. My research started from the data, which was then analyzed from different perspectives, by different methods, which are characteristic of different semantic frameworks.

Viewed in such terms, the present study aims to fill a gap in the field of Slavic translation studies. Despite the numerous studies of Slavonic translations from Greek in the Middle Ages, there are only a few works that use a strictly semantic approach to analyze the translations. (I discuss the existing scholarship on Slavonic translations and lexical variation in section 1.3.)

1.2. The Greek Text of the Thekara and its Slavonic translation: sources and distribution

The data of my study are drawn from a medieval text that was written in Greek and translated into Church Slavonic. Both the Greek and the Slavonic texts are preserved in numerous manuscripts, beginning in the fourteenth century and extending as late as the eighteenth century. The text is monastic in its genre and function; it was originally written by a Greek monk, copied and disseminated by monks, and probably translated into Slavonic by monks. What follows is a more detailed description of the Greek and the Slavonic manuscripts and their written tradition, as well as of the genre and structure of the text itself.
1.2.1 The Greek text

“Divine and beautiful,” “the rarest treasure,” “a horn of mystical sound” – these are some of the ways in which 14th-century Greek monks described the book of the *Thekara*. What they were describing was an Orthodox spiritual text with a tradition that was vital in the period from the 14th through the 19th centuries.

The text in question is the Greek *Horologion* of Thekara, which I. Mansvetov describes in detail in his book on Church rules. In order to provide a better idea of the nature and the use of the *Thekara* in the monastic community of Mount Athos, I will quote a passage from Mansvetov:

The Athonite monk Thekara is known for his commentaries (толкования) of Church hymns, a narrative about their origin, and a daily cycle Office for monastic use. The *Horologion* of Thekara follows in general the order of the Jerusalem *Horologia*, but differs from them in introducing particular hymns, prayers and *troparia*, some of which are his original work, while others belong to other writers. Thekara also discusses the way to conduct the Office during communal gatherings of the monks (εἰ ἐστὶ συνοδία) and in private, in monk's cells (κατ' ἑδίκα)

Thekara's *Horologion* was very popular on Mount Athos within the monastic community. In the Introduction to the *Horologion*, we find instructions to keep the book in the monastic library (ἐν σκευοφυλακίῳ). The book could [only] be taken out if there were monks who wanted to copy the Office of the daily cycle with the prayers, since these particular parts were the most needed; the commentaries of the hymns and the narrative about their origin could be omitted.

---

4 Mansvetov makes a reference here to the Synodal manuscript Sin. Greek 269. On the last page of the manuscript, a colophon reveals the date of the completion of the manuscript, τέλος τοῦ παρόντος βιβλίου ἐν ἑτεί ζωῆ (6849=1341) μὴν μικρὴν ἱνδίκτ. θ. (Mansvetov 1885: 226-227).

5 Mansvetov 1885: 226-227.
It is clear from Mansvetov’s description that the most frequently copied part of Thekara’s *Horologion* was the daily cycle with prayers. This fact provides an additional validation of the text I choose to analyze here, namely, the Midnight Office.

The Greek text of the monk Thekara’s *’Υμνος τριαδικός σὺν εὐχῇ εἰς τὸ μεσονυκτικόν ἐκ δογμάτων τοῦ Ἁγίου Διονυσίου τοῦ Ἀρεοπαγίτου. ἐκλογὴ καὶ σύνταξις Θηκαρὰ μοναχοῦ* (‘Triadic hymn with Midnight prayer from the Dogmatics of the Holy Dionysius the Areopagite. Compilation and Composition of the Monk Thekara’) consists of original prayers and triadic hymns by Thekara himself, as well as prayers attributed to Symeon the New Theologian, Basil the Great, Nicephoros Blemidos, and others, which were added in a later period. All of these components are organized in a daily cycle, which starts with the Midnight Office (*μεσονυκτικόν/polunoštntica*) and ends with Compline (*ἀπόθειπνον/povečerje*).

The text exhibits the typical features of its liturgical genre: lack of narrative, repetitions on the level of syntagmas, common rhetorical devices such as antithesis, syntactic parallelism, pleonasms, etc. The function of the text was to be read both in private (in the monastic cells) and communally, as a part of the liturgy. Furthermore, the monastic function of the text is also observable on the level of its language, which exhibits clear references or allusions frequently to the Psalter, and to a lesser degree, to the texts of the Gospels and the Apostle. Certain prayers in the text are written in the penitential style; that is, they are oriented towards self-derogatory discourse as a means of repenting one’s sins. Naturally, the sins appear in long lists in different prayers, similarly
to the listings of sins in the Slavonic Kormčaia kniga (Nomokanon or Canon Law Code). In addition, the monastic orientation of the Thekara makes it functionally and, to a certain extent, linguistically parallel to other solely monastic genres such as the genre of the monastic Pandects (the monastic code of laws).

This information is highly relevant for the analysis of the lexical variation in the Thekara because it is necessary to consider the specific conventions of written texts and, in particular, texts of the monastic genre. In fact, we see that the text exhibits a fair amount of formulaic language which would not be a feature of texts of other written genres or, presumably, of spoken discourse. Therefore, by recognizing the scope and the peculiarities of monastic discourse, I define the limitations that my data present and the limitations of my analysis of this data.

For the purposes of this study, I focus only on one particular part of the Thekara daily cycle, the Midnight Office. The reasons for such a choice lie in the very nature of this office, which is in and of itself a separate entity and not directly related to the other parts of the daily cycle. Moreover, the linguistic data extracted from the Midnight Office is representative of the whole. Although it is relatively short (34 folia), it demonstrates both the problems of meaning transfer and also the solutions to these problems found by the Slavic translators.

Without going into any great detail, I will outline scholarly opinions regarding the identity of the author of the Thekara compilation. In the opinion of the majority of researchers, the monk Thekara lived and worked in the 14th century. Some researchers such as J. P. Migne (1844), Archimandrite Philaretos (1864: 112), Karl Krumbacher (1897: 548-550), and H. Beck (1959: 704-5), among others, identify him as the 14th-
century writer Thomas Magister or the monk Theodul. However, these suppositions are debatable since there are 11th-century copies of Thekara’s texts, including the daily cycle, and the monk Dionysius from the 14th century states that Theodul was a student of Thekara. These data is uncovered in the most recent publication on this problem, the dissertation of the Greek scholar S. Skalistes (1984) that rejects equating Thekara with Thomas Magister and Theodul (274-5). An additional difficulty for the attribution of the text stems from the fact that there is not a single source with a reference to the lay name of “Thekara.” This situation is peculiar but not uncommon for the Middle Ages; it is discussed in Theodul’s Diegesis: “I swore not to reveal his [Thekara’s] name in order not to make it known in this town; also because of education and virtues for glorification.”

The only two biographical references relate that Thekara was “a monk from Constantinople” and that he was “a master of making swords,” which is, in fact, the etymology of his name. It is quite possible that this etymology is a secondary one, a result of the “philological” work of 14th-century monks who wrote about Thekara. In any case, there is not enough evidence to answer the question about Thekara’s identity, and I will not attempt to resolve this question in the present study.

---

6 Skalistes cites one 11th-century codex from the Jerusalem Library No 91 of the Ὡμνος τρισδικίας σὺν εὐχῇ εἰς τὸ μεσονυκτικὸν ἐκ διαμάτων τοῦ Ἀγίου Διονυσίου τοῦ Ἁρεοπαγίτου, ἐκλογὴ καὶ σύνταξις Θηκάρα μοναχοῦ (1984: 228).

7 This passage is taken from the Iviron Monastery’s Greek manuscript No. 400 of the 15th century, f. 6r. Certainly, we find in this text the traditional humility topoi, which are characteristic of monastic discourse.

8 The Greek word θηκάριον means ‘sheath.’
The distribution of the Greek text of the *Thekara* is quite large. About 252 Greek copies of works attributed to the monk Thekara are preserved on Mount Athos, in the Jerusalem Library, on Mount Sinai, and in Italy, Moscow and other European repositories.\(^9\) The oldest Greek copy of the Midnight Office, accessible to me, dates to the 14\(^{th}\) century; it is a parchment copy of 1341 from the Moscow State Historical Museum (GIM). In this study I examine sixteen Greek manuscripts of *Thekara*es Midnight Office as well as the Venetian printed edition of 1783.

One difficulty with studying the Slavonic translation of the *Thekara* is that the Greek tradition is insufficiently studied. I try, wherever possible, to present the variation, since it quite possibly gave rise to some of the lexical variation in the Slavonic translation.

The following Greek manuscripts from the Greek Synodal (Sin.) Collection of the State Historical Museum in Moscow were studied for the purposes of this dissertation.\(^10\)

- Sin. 269 (305), parchment, 1341
- Sin. 334 (306), 16\(^{th}\) century
- Sin. 301 (307), 16\(^{th}\) century

The bulk of the Greek manuscripts of Thekara are found in the Patriarchal Institute in Thessaloniki, Greece. The Institute’s collection comes from the Athonite

---

\(^9\) These texts are: Ὠρολόγιον σὺν θεῷ τῶν θείων ύμνων καὶ εὐχαὶ μετὰ τροπαρίων εἰς τὸ ψαλτήριον εἰςὶ δὲ πόνημα Θηκαρά; Προοίμιον τοῦ Θηκαρᾶ τῶν περὶ πίστεως λόγων; Τοῦ αὐτοῦ περὶ τῆς προσηκούσης τυπώσεως καὶ συντάξεως τῶν ύμνων καὶ ἔρμηνεια μερικῆ ἐπὶ τούτοις.

\(^{10}\) The numbers of the manuscripts are given according to the Greek Catalog of Arximandrit Vladimir (1894).
monasteries and is preserved on microfilm. For my study I examine the following manuscripts from this collection.\footnote{The numbers of the manuscripts are given according to Lambros’ catalog of Greek manuscripts from Mount Athos. The names of the monasteries on Mount Athos are given according to the transliteration given on the official website of the Hellenic Ministry of Culture, \url{http://www.culture.gr}.}

- Dionysiou monastery 4005 (15th c.)
- Dionysiou monastery 4038 (15th c.)
- Dionysiou monastery 3976 (15th c.)
- Panteleimon monastery 5829 (17th c.)
- Panteleimon monastery 5895 (16th c.)
- Panteleimon monastery 5894 (17th c.)
- Iviron monastery 4943 (17th c.)
- Iviron monastery 4655 (16th c.)
- Docheiareiou monastery 2916 (17th c.)
- Xeropotamou monastery 2403 (16th c.)
- Philotheou monastery 1925 (16th c.)
- Koutloumousiou monastery 3409 (16th c.)
- Zographou monastery 339 (17th c.)

After I collated the sixteen Greek manuscripts and the printed editions, it appeared that there were some differences on a textual and lexical level within the group of the Greek manuscripts. Thus, I tentatively divided the Greek manuscripts into two groups based on these differences.\footnote{I discuss these differences in Chapter 3.} Lexical variation in the Greek tradition could be indicative of the fact that the Slavic translators had different Greek copies in front of them or even had more than one Greek copy to consult.

The Greek manuscript that will be the principal copy-text for comparison with the Slavic translation is from the GIM collection, Sin 269. This manuscript was chosen because it is the earliest Greek manuscript of the compilation of the \textit{Thekara}. Since my task in this study is to analyze not the Greek manuscript tradition except insofar as it was
relevant for the translation techniques in Slavic, I will not go into detail about the variation in the Greek tradition; I will record only those significant differences within the Greek tradition that could have led to the variation in the Slavic group of manuscripts. The printed edition from Venice, "ΕΓΧΕΙΡ'ΙΔΙΟΝ καλούμενον ΘΗΚΑΡΑΣ Πορὰ Νικολάω Γλαυκεί τῷ ἔξ "Ἰωαννίνων (1783), is also helpful because one can clearly see the changes in the Greek tradition that occurred as a result of the numerous times the text was copied.

1.2.2 The Slavonic translation

The Slavonic translation is also attested in two groups, but there is no one-to-one correspondence between the Slavic subdivisions and the Greek subdivisions. I use the sigla “version α” and “version β” to represent the two Slavic manuscript translation traditions. Version α is attested in ten Slavic manuscripts: eight from the Hilandar Research Library, one from Šafařík’s Collection in the National Museum in Prague, and one from the Collection of the Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church in Belgrade.

The text of the Midnight office in the copy from the Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church is identical to the text in the Hilandar manuscripts. The text in the Šafařík’s copy

---

13 This specific 16th-century manuscript is mentioned by Radojčić (1962: 145) and Dančev (1983a: 33). The complete content of the manuscript under the signature IX F 19 (§ 6) is given in the Czech catalog of the Prague National Museum by Vášica and Vajs (1957: 231-6). I was able to study the microfilm of the manuscript thanks to the help of my Czech colleague Václav Čermák.

14 This manuscript is listed under No 1532 in Bogdanović (1982) and under 682 in Subotin-Golubović (1999: 222). Its original signature from the Collection of the Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church is 211, cf. Mošin (1955: 224).
also belongs to the translation of α, except for a few instances where the text sides with version β in its lexical choice.\(^{15}\)

Version β is attested in only one manuscript, a Slavic manuscript No 63 from the Saint Trinity monastery near Pljevlja (in present-day Montenegro) from the second half of the 16\(^{th}\) century.\(^{16}\)

The Hilandar group of manuscripts, the translation of which is represented with α, includes the following manuscripts:\(^{17}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hilandar 491</td>
<td>17th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilandar 492</td>
<td>17th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilandar 493</td>
<td>17th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilandar 494</td>
<td>17th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilandar 495</td>
<td>17th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilandar 497</td>
<td>17th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilandar 498</td>
<td>17th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilandar 642</td>
<td>16(^{th}) c.(^{18})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The story of my detective work on locating the manuscripts that contain the Midnight Office of the Thekara would not be complete if I didn’t mention two

---

\(^{15}\) At present, there is not enough information to determine the textological relation between these groups of texts; this problem requires further research.

\(^{16}\) This manuscript is listed under No 1844 in Bogdanović (1982), No 800 in Subotin-Golubović (1999: 227) and under No 78 in Mošin (1958: 251).

\(^{17}\) The manuscripts of the Hilandar Monastery on Mount Athos were available to me on microfilm due to the good will of the Hilandar monks and the generous support of the staff of the Hilandar Research Library at The Ohio State University, with Dr. Predrag Matejic as its director. I would like to sincerely thank all involved.

\(^{18}\) The numbers of the manuscripts are given according to the catalog of Bogdanović (1978).
manuscripts from the National Library in Belgrade, R 627 and R 628.\(^{19}\) We know of their existence only from catalogs since they perished during the fire of April 6\(^{th}\), 1941, caused by Nazi bombardment of the Library.

Although it is clear in some instances that the Slavic translators/editors had different Greek texts in front of them, most of the cases of lexical variation in the Slavic groups are evidently due to the Slavic translators’ individual treatments of one and the same Greek word.

Despite the fact that the Slavonic translations of the works of Thekara the Monk were apparently copied and disseminated in the Orthodox lands, they have been almost completely overlooked in the past scholarship on medieval Slavic writing. Their existence has been only mentioned (Dančev 1983a, Radojčić 1962), and no complete survey of the manuscripts of all texts attributed to the Monk Thekara exists in the literature. Neither Dančev nor Radojčić discusses the compilation of Thekara based on Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, which is the object of the present study. This lack of attention is remarkable, considering that the Thekara is a relatively rare example of a Slavonic translation in the (quasi-) philosophical tradition.

Dančev, who works with the ‘Collected prayers’ of Thekara, has an incomplete survey of Greek and Slavic manuscripts of this particular text (1980; 1983b). Some of the manuscripts that he lists also contain the monastic compilation of Thekara "Ὑμνος

\(^{19}\) The numbers are given according to Bogdanović (1982: 215). Subotin-Golubović mentions one of the them, R 627, under No 681 (1999: 222); Radojčić also has a note about this manuscript (1962: 145), which was originally copied in 1646 at St. Paul’s Scete on Mount Athos, later on taken to monastery of the Peć Patriarchate and finally purchased by the National Library in Belgrade in 1926-7. The complete content of R 627 (26 folia) is given under No 204 (1217) in Matić (1952: 159-162). Although the manuscript contained works of Thekara the Monk, the text of the Midnight Office is not among them. The other manuscript, R 628, came from the Monastery of Šišatovac and dated to the 17\(^{th}\) century. No content
which is studied here.

Apparently, no research has been done on the linguistic peculiarities of the Slavonic translations of the works of Monk Thekara. Therefore, the present study undertakes to initiate such research, at least on one of the many texts of Thekara. Hopefully, this will be a foundation for future linguistic studies of the prolific Greek author, the Monk Thekara.

1.3. Previous research on Slavonic medieval translations and lexical variation

There are many studies devoted to medieval Slavonic translations from Greek. Some of them focus on the internal structure of the Old Church Slavonic lexicon while drawing comparisons with Greek as the source language (Cejtlin 1986; Davidov 1996). In his study of certain lexical variants in Slavonic, the Bulgarian scholar Angel Davidov analyzes the semantic structure and syntagmatic relations between the variants, also making reference to the general and collocational semantics of the Greek source words.20 The Russian scholar Ralja Cejtlin presents a great amount of lexical data from OCS texts, which she approaches predominantly from a derivational point of view. She also touches upon the nature and status of textological doublets, observing differences in their general semantics but similarity in particular contexts. Cejtlin also draws attention to the common

information of this manuscript is available to me at this time, except the title Thekara, which is listed in Bogdanović (1982: 215).

20 See his treatment of the lexical variation ὑπερτ. – σκομάτ. (‘poor’) as variant translations of the Greek πτωχός in Davidov 1996: 122.
mistake of confusing the dialectal origin of a word (e.g., Ohrid vs. Preslav) with its lexical semantics and stylistics (Cejtlin 1986: 68). Wherever possible, she tries to apply the semantic approach to the OCS vocabulary, including an interpretation of the syntactic and semantic combinatorial properties of the words.\footnote{See particularly her excellent analysis of the semantics of πνικυκηλη, (‘distressed’) and its regular and contextual doublets in Cejtlin 1986: 116-119.} Needless to say, the amount of material she uses does not allow her to do an in-depth semantic analysis of all words. Despite this, her study still remains an example of a more analytical (and not purely descriptive) approach to the OCS vocabulary and lexical variation.

Other studies are more general observations on translation theory and practice, which attempt to look at the various aspects of translation practice as well as the lexical, semantic and grammatical structure of Old Church Slavonic and Greek (Minčeva 1982, Vereščagin 1997, Večerka 1997, etc.). In addition, there are studies that focus predominantly on the lexical data of some particular text or author by conducting lexical analysis for the purposes of determining the principles of translation and the structural characteristics of the Slavonic lexicon (Trost 1978, Dobrev 1979, Miklas 1986, Xaralampiev 1990, Taseva and Jovčeva 1995, Spasova 1999, Cibranska-Kostova 2000, Nikolaeva 2000, Maksimovič 2002, etc.). The most frequent approach to lexical data and lexical variation in Slavonic translations from Greek is the analysis of lexical and grammatical material together with sound textological work for establishing the written tradition of a particular text or genre (e.g., Slavova 1989 and 1990 on the Gospel; Češko 1989a and Karačorova 1989 on the Psalter; Ogren 1989 and Voss 1997 on the Paraenesis of Ephraem the Syrian; Xristova 2004 on the Aprakos Apostle; Mostrova 1991 on The
The profound study of the Slavonic *Aprakos* Apostle, a codex containing both the Acts and the Epistles done recently by the Bulgarian scholar Iskra Xristova (2004). In her study, Xristova attempts to cover both textological and linguistic problems of the Slavic translation of this particular biblical book. Her study is also dedicated to lexical variation, which for her is a sure indicator that there were two major redactions of the *Aprakos* Apostle – the Preslav and the Athonite. In her work, Xristova adopts an approach similar to the present study; she analyzes the instances of various lexical variations in the Apostle by taking into consideration the biblical context, the semantics of the Slavonic and the Greek words, and, in some cases, the modern Bulgarian expression of the medieval variants. Since the amount of lexical data in her study is quite large, it was perhaps not possible to interpret every single case of lexical variation with the same degree of thoroughness and to provide an account of all possible factors for the lexical variation.

In general, the majority of the studies on Slavonic translation and lexical variation concentrate on the lexical and semantic characteristics of Church Slavonic (CS). This traditional philological approach, however, imposes certain limitations on the field of historical lexical semantics. Without completely ignoring the methods of general linguistics,\(^\text{22}\) Slavic scholars have, for the most part, somehow managed to avoid the application of linguistic methods in their research on medieval Slavic translation, thus isolating the field from the newest developments in lexical semantics. In their work on

\[^\text{22}\text{ I refer here to various mainstream linguistic theories of lexical semantics that have been developed in the past 50 years: structuralist semantics, cognitive semantics, formal semantics, etc.}\]
Church Slavonic vocabulary, scholars have mostly approached the lexical material as a means for establishing the existence of a translation of the Greek text or redactions of the Slavonic translation. Certainly, such works are much needed in view of the complex history of the Slavonic literary language and its literary tradition. Hand in hand with the textological work on medieval Slavic texts, most scholars have also tried to interpret various translation practices and principles: “word-for-word” and “morpheme-for-morpheme” are two of the most frequent labels that Bulgarian and Russian scholars, for example, give to different translation principles. In doing that, however, they neglect the explanatory part of the analysis, namely, why the translators used a particular way to translate a Greek word in a particular context.

Furthermore, translation principles have been defined and classified predominantly with reference to derivation, in such a way that meanings have been ascribed to prefixes and suffixes without any analysis of how and why different translators used different derivational methods.

One of the most recent attempts at a more general classification of translation principles and techniques can be found in Maksimović 2002. Without any pretension of originality, Kiril Maksimović nevertheless offers a systematic description of various techniques of translation observable in the earliest Slavic translation of the Byzantine “Common Law,” the so-called Закон судный людем, which Maksimović attributes to

---

23 See Maksimović’s statement that “предлагаемая здесь терминология является экспериментальной, хотя во многом опирается на уже существующие разработки” (“the terminology offered here is experimental, although in many ways, it is based on already existing works”), 2002: 32.
Methodius. The scholar uses various references, mostly socio-cultural, but also some that refer to the translator’s manipulation of the lexical semantics of words, to interpret the lexical choices of the translator. In so doing, he makes the general observation that the principles of clarity and precision rooted in the socio-cultural context of Methodius’ mission were the driving force behind the translator’s various techniques (Maksimović 2002: 36).

Other studies go beyond the traditional philological description and touch upon the mechanisms of semantic signification. Francis Thomson (1988) analyzes particular mechanisms of translation that led to errors in the Slavonic copies, and Irina Ogren (1991) takes a similar approach in her work on the Paraenesis of Ephraem the Syrian. C. M. MacRobert (1993) looks at the whole range of mechanisms of translation work responsible for certain types of lexical variation in the Psalter. In her work on the Psalter, MacRobert raises important questions about the nature of lexical variation in the Slavonic translation and redactions of the Psalter. The goals of her research are very similar to the goals of the present study – to “uncover the motivation which determined their (the lexical variants) occurrence” and to “arrive at a clearer idea of the principles and techniques which the primary translator applied and which later redactors seem in large part to have regarded as satisfactory” (MacRobert 1992: 261-262). Her conclusions are informed by the current linguistic research on semantic fields and in particular, the interpretation of semantic distinctions within a particular lexical field.\(^{24}\)

\(^{24}\) An example of different points of semantic distinction in Greek and Slavonic within the same semantic field of “desire” and “volition” is given in the case of the Greek ἐκλέγεσθαι, ἀιρετίζειν, βούλεσθαι, θέλειν, ἐπιθυμεῖν, ἐπιτοθεῖν, and ἀγαπάν and the Slavonic же́лать, же́ловати, каса́ться, каса́ться, and кеша́ться (MacRobert 1993: 267-271).
Clearly, there are certain problems that scholars face when interpreting Slavonic translation techniques and reasons for lexical variation. Apart from the already mentioned limitations posed by the philological approach of the majority of studies, there is yet another not entirely methodological problem – the lack of a historical dictionary of Church Slavonic. In a study of a later linguistic redaction of a particular text, it is vital to make reference to the semantics of given words in a given time frame, especially if the chronological distance between the original text and its redactions is a matter of a few centuries. It is well known in historical linguistics that the semantics of a given word can change substantially over time, a fact that could influence the scholarly interpretation of a word and its meaning, sometimes in the direction of anachronistic interpretation.  

I adopt a somewhat different approach in my study in regard to the dynamics of lexical semantics. I analyze the lexical variation in the Slavonic translation of the Thekara in its synchronic appearance, as I will attend also to the textological problem of translation and redaction. In this respect, the lexical variation in the Thekara could be viewed as a result of either a later redaction of an early translation or as multiple (perhaps independent) translations. Such a distinction would not change my interpretation of the mechanisms of translation, but would merely point to the individual (or collective) linguistic preference of the translators or redactors.

One example from the Thekara will clarify this point. Compare the following passage:

---

\(^{25}\) Čejtlin gives one such example of anachronistic interpretation of the semantics of the word \(\text{яблко} \): the meaning ‘truth,’ which is sometimes wrongfully assumed as the translation for this word in Old Church Slavonic (OCS) texts, was not present in OCS but developed later, as a semantic extension of ‘justice’ or ‘just/right thing’ (Čejtlin 1986: 103).
What is clear is that the Slavonic version \( \alpha \) translated the Greek faithfully, rendering \( \pi\lambda\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\acute{a} \) (‘the palm of the hand as a measure of length’) with \( \pi\epsilon\alpha\iota\iota \) (‘measured by the palm of the hand’). The other version, \( \beta \), did not generate such a literal meaning but made an unexpected semantic shift to \( \kappa \) \( \pi\delta\alpha\beta\iota\gamma\omega\nu \) (‘for/to a great or martyr’s deed’), which produces a coherent reading in this context. This semantic difference between both versions is a fact no matter how it happened technically. It is not important for my analysis to find out whether version \( \alpha \) corrected version \( \beta \) or vice versa or whether the lexical variation was a result of the work of two independent Slavic translators who had different views on how to render the semantics of this particular Greek word. What is important in this case is the fact that both Slavonic versions or translations referred to the Greek word (with or without knowledge of the other Slavonic text); this will be shown in my semantic analysis in Chapters 4, 5, 6 and 7. On the basis of this fact, I interpret each lexical variant as an equally “good” translation of the Greek, but with a different motivation or focus on the semantics of the Greek word in context, which, respectively, yielded different translations. Therefore, the objective of my study is to find out how and why two different Slavonic words translated one Greek word in the same context and what
the mechanisms are that permitted such cross-linguistic transfer of meaning, which gave rise to particular types of lexical variation in the Slavonic translation of the *Thekara*.\(^{26}\)

### 1.4. Research methods

As noted above, my research focuses on the phenomenon of lexical variation in Slavonic translations from Greek. It has been pointed out in earlier studies that “the reasons for lexical variation continue to be a subject of debate” (MacRobert 1993: 254). The difficulty in interpreting cases of lexical variation lies in the heterogeneous types of the variation in my data, which range from more or less clear cases of concrete vocabulary (φρονήματα - миси for the Greek ῥομφέοντες, ‘sword-carrying’), the translation of abstract vocabulary such as that of emotions (εμπαθία - читане for the Greek δέος, ‘fear’) to the translation of metaphors (γοβέματα - климо for the Greek ἄναβασσομένης τῆς καρδίας, ‘burning heart’). Recognizing the heterogeneity of the analyzed data was the first step in my research, which naturally led to the second one – the determination of how we should approach such diverse data and what kind of semantic analysis can we apply in order to deliver a systematic explanation.

Most current semantic theories do not offer an unified approach to the whole lexicon but rather choose a particular part of it for the purposes of their analysis. It is not

\(^{26}\) The possibility that the two Slavic translators worked with two different Greek versions is discussed in detail in Chapter 3.
surprising that the favored data for scholars working in the framework of feature semantics is drawn from the more or less concrete (or distinctively referential) nominal vocabulary or that cognitive linguists working with events or frames prefer to work with verbal vocabulary with cognitively identifiable schemata. One of the scholars who recognizes the limitations of the various semantic theories in regard to their data is the Italian scholar Patrizia Violi in her book on meaning and experience (Violi 2001). She attributes the difficulty of achieving a unified treatment of the whole lexicon to the fact that “lexical meanings appear in the form of diversified, partially superimposed, structures.” According to Violi, the inadequacy of all semantic approaches thus far results from their claim of being sole, all-encompassing models. Thus, the real problem is the totalizing nature of any model, which imposes itself over and above all other models, presuming to possess the only explicative criteria. In reality, things are not like that at all, and no model seems entirely capable of dealing exhaustively with the whole lexicon; different representations exist alongside one another and require the co-presence of a plurality of variously articulated models (Violi 2001: 219). A similar view has been expressed by Charles Fillmore (Fillmore 2003) in his discussion of the organization of semantic information of the lexicon. He states that “semantic theory must reject the suggestion that all meanings need to be described in the same terms” (2003: 282). Fillmore bases his argument on the observation that there are various kinds of word meanings. Some words seem to have a more or less straightforward stable relationship with some aspect of the world (color words, natural kinds, and others).... Other words (pilot, diary, tea cup) have to be described as designating objects by reference to their function or their characteristic activity. Still others (lazy, witty,
genius, fool) designate entities according to their dependable positions. Still others (widow, tenure, and apple core) can be understood only within the framework of an understanding of a social institution or a way of doing things (Fillmore 2003: 282).

Thus, a model such as Violi’s “non-unified model of lexical semantics” has its justification in the semantic organization of the lexicon. My own interpretation of the lexical variation in the Thekara is based on the same assumption that different descriptions are needed for different words.\(^{27}\)

The sole difference between my approach and Violi’s lies in the nature of the data we analyze. While she deals exclusively with one language (English), I focus on two languages simultaneously by virtue of the fact that the Slavonic lexical variation was a response to the Greek text. Some of the questions I raise are related to different translation practices, the semantic and cognitive motivation for such translations and the consequent lexical variation, the relation between the two lexical items chosen to render one Greek word in a particular context, etc.

Although the primary goal of my research is to reveal the cross-linguistic semantic transfer as a factor in the lexical variation, I will often refer to other factors contributing to the two different translations of one single Greek word: grammatical motivation, rhetorical organization, stylistic refinement, etc. The combination of all these factors and their interpretation will eventually delineate certain translation techniques and principles used by the Slavic translators of the Thekara.

\(^{27}\) I elaborate more on my own approach in Chapter 2, where I show exactly why I use the non-unified approach to lexical semantics and what the specific features of this approach are.
An analysis of techniques and principles in medieval translations is by its nature and method different from an analysis of modern translations; in medieval translation we face insufficient data on contextual meanings, and we have to account for the dynamic nature of lexical semantics. Therefore, the inferences we draw about the meaning of a word can only be tentative, since we may discover new uses of the word that broaden the scope of its semantic fields. The best way to deal with these problems is to offer a semantic representation of the source Greek words and their Slavonic counterparts based on their attestations in context.

My goal is also to look at the relations between words in a particular lexical variation and in the lexicon in general. Since there are no native speakers of Church Slavonic (the language of the translation of the *Thekara*), my method involves analyzing the occurrences of the words in various contexts, and especially in lexical collocations. Regular collocations bring to light the most common (or central) meaning of the Slavonic words and highlight the points of similarity between the meanings of two lexical items. I am aware that it is difficult to analyze completely the points of contrast and similarities of the vocabulary of a premodern language, because of the lack of any pragmatic situation. However, research on the language and translation techniques of the New Testament has proved to be successful in the works of Silva (1983), Nida (2001), Tov (1999) and others.28

28 I offer a brief account on some of the works on biblical translations in Chapter 2.
1.5. Research procedures and data collection

There were four stages in my research. The first stage involved collecting all the Slavic sources and a large number of the Greek sources. Two significant factors in this stage of research were the catalog data about the existence and location of the manuscripts and their accessibility. Naturally, it was impossible to collect every single manuscript copy of the text; therefore I opted for gathering data from those Greek manuscripts which indicated lexical variation within the Greek tradition, which potentially resulted in lexical variation in the Slavonic translation.

The second stage was closely connected to the first but focused more thoroughly on organizing the manuscripts into groups according to their linguistic and textual features. This procedure yielded interesting results regarding the nature of the Greek and Slavic manuscript traditions of the text.

The third stage was the collation of the Greek and the Slavonic sources in order to record the various instances of the Slavonic (and Greek, in some cases) lexical variation. My work at that stage included going through the text of the liturgical office of μεσημεριακόν (polunošćenica) or Midnight Office in all of the Greek and Slavonic copies used in order to register all cases of lexical variation. The results of this work are presented in Appendix A, where I list alphabetically (according to the Greek word) all instances of lexical variation in the Midnight office. Some of these instances of lexical variation are quite trivial and will not be discussed in this dissertation. Instead, I focus on particular cases of lexical variation that offer insight into the translation mechanisms and various methods of semantic signification.
My presentation of the data follows the typical manner of presenting lexical variation in medieval texts – namely, providing a sufficient amount of context both of the source text (Greek in this case) and the target text (Slavonic). I also provide my own English translation of the Greek text with some additional translation of the Slavonic wherever it differs substantially in meaning from the Greek. The Greek text of all New Testament citations is taken from the fourth revised edition of Kurt Aland (Aland et al, 2001), and the English translation from the Revised Standard Version of the English Bible (1974). The Greek and the English translation of the Septuagint are given according to the edition of Brenton (1995). The English translation of all non-Biblical sources is mine.

Since my research is not based on a corpus but instead deals with one very specific and unique text, I will not attempt to provide any statistical data about the lexical variation.

The last stage is the most important for this study – the semantic analysis of the lexical variation. I deliberately rejected the deductive approach in my study, which begins with a particular theoretical framework and then “fits” the data into that framework. I started with the data, which turned out to be quite heterogeneous and not describable by a single system of representation. This situation also created some difficulties in the process of classifying the data. Looking for a common denominator as a basis for classification, I decided on a subdivision of the data that accounted for some of the factors of the lexical variation, namely, polysemy of the source words, ambiguity of the context in the Greek text, semantic complexity of the Greek imagery, etc. Furthermore, I organized these factors according to the translator’s focus on different dimensions of meaning – referential,
perceptual, socio-cultural, axiological or evaluative. In my analysis of the nature of the lexical variation, I argue that the focus on one or more of the different dimensions of meaning as well as enunciation is what yielded the different types of lexical variation. By “enunciation” I mean the specific path(s) that were taken by the Slavic translators to arrive at a particular metaphoric image and that are identifiable through the particular semantics of the chosen lexical variant.

The present study consists of eight chapters. This first chapter is an introduction to the goals and objectives of the dissertation, along with its methodology. It also offers some insights on the Slavic scholarship in the field of medieval translations.

Chapter 2 discusses theoretical and terminological problems in the fields of lexical semantics and translation studies. I also define my approach to the object of this study, the lexical variation in the Slavonic translation of the *Thekara*.

Chapters 3 to 7 are the central part of the dissertation. There I offer my analysis of different types of lexical variation and discuss the motivation and the mechanisms of this variation.

Finally, in the conclusions in Chapter 8, I summarize my findings and consider their possible implications for the fields of lexical semantics and translation studies.

The dissertation has two appendices. Appendix A gives a trilingual (Greek-Slavonic-English) lexical index of all Slavonic variants occurring in the Midnight Office of the *Thekara*, while Appendix B contains illustrations of manuscript folia from the Greek text and the two Slavonic versions of the translation. These illustrations are hyperlinked to

---

29 These particular dimensions of meaning are outlined in Violi (2001: 230) and will be discussed in depth in Chapter 2.
each example of lexical variation in the study, providing a larger context of the lexical choices of the Slavic translators.
CHAPTER 2

LEXICAL SEMANTICS IN TRANSLATION STUDIES AND
THE CASE OF LEXICAL VARIATION

Translation studies is a fast-growing field, as many scholars have come to realize the need of a well-defined linguistic approach to translation that accounts for the linguistic and cognitive mechanisms of meaning transfer from one language to another.\(^\text{30}\) I have, therefore, two goals in this chapter: to present different approaches to lexical semantics in the field of translation studies,\(^\text{31}\) and to situate my own research and methodology in approaching Slavic lexical variation in translations.

2.1. Defining meaning in translation

The object of the present study, lexical variation in translation, cannot be interpreted sufficiently without reference to meaning and, in particular, the transfer of meaning in translations. The common truth is that “anything that can be said in one

\(^{30}\) See one of the groundbreaking works in translation studies, Catford’s *A Linguistic Theory of Translation* (1965).

\(^{31}\) I will not attempt an exhaustive description of all available theoretical frameworks in translation studies; this has been already done in the book of Jeremy Munday, *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications* (2001), to which I direct readers.
language can be said in another. It is possible to translate” (Larson 1998: 12). However, anyone practicing translation knows from experience that finding the “right words” in the target language to reproduce the meaning of the source language is a difficult task. If anything is translatable, then why is finding a good semantic equivalent in translation a challenge, as we can see in various translations of one and the same text? Why do we have numerous Modern English translations of the Bible, which, most of the time, exhibit great lexical variation?

Consider four English translations of the Greek πώρωσις in Romans 11:25, (ὅτι πώρωσις ἀπὸ μέρους τῶν Ἰσραήλ γέγονεν), some of which show substantial differences in their lexical choices:

2. “Some of them [the people of Israel] have become stubborn” (Contemporary English Version).
3. “That blindness in part is happened to Israel” (King James’s Version, 1611).
4. “That hardness in part to Israel had happened” (Young, Literal Translation of the Bible, 1898).

All of these examples demonstrate not only the diverse nature of the lexical variation, but also a great amount of interpretation behind each translator’s choice. It is hard to define the boundary between translations such as these and “pure” interpretation, such as the one found in Strong’s Biblical Concordance of the meaning of the word πώρωσις: 1. “The
covering with a callus; 2. Obtrusiveness of mental discernment, dulled perception; 3. The mind of one has been blunted.”

There are a few important issues that emerge from the above-cited cases. First, when we observe such lexical variation as in the case of the English translation of Greek, it is always the context that determines the particular reading of a word. Moreover, in the given context, the relationships among the senses of the words in the lexical variation are enunciated in a way that makes possible a figurative reading of both “blindness” and “hardening.” Second, we need to distinguish the differences among the senses of the words and the differences between the words and their referents. Such a distinction is relevant in order to determine the different types of lexical variation. Consider the following examples from Moisés Silva (1983: 121): “The beloved disciple” and “the author of the fourth Gospel.” Silva states that these examples “do/do not refer to (denote) the same person.” In other words, when we have several words that point to one and the same referent, the semantic signification of each word is subject to a focus or emphasis on different characteristics or features from our world knowledge. Compare, for example, Silva (ibid. 124), who, quoting Trench’s analysis of synonyms in the New Testament, distinguishes among the five words equivalent to English “servant” in Greek: δούλος (emphasis on servility), σύμφωνος (emphasis on familiarity), θεράπων (emphasis on noble attitude), διάκονος (emphasis on activity), ὑπηρέτης (emphasis on the official character of the servant). Silva states that the first three are based on different nuances in the relationship between the servant and the person served. Silva does not specifically comment on the fourth and the fifth examples, but it is clear that they pertain to social roles and evaluation of these roles, respectively. Apparently, in these cases, we witness
what Mildred Larson calls the “mismatching of lexical systems between languages,” where the source and the target language “are different in how the lexical inventory is grouped and divided” (Larson 1998: 97).

A different case of the mismatching of lexical systems between languages occurs in the case of certain cognate words. English *anger* and German *Ärger*, which are typically viewed as semantic (and translational, for that matter) equivalents, appear to be synonymous in some contexts, but in others they each cover different semantic fields. For example, the German expression *Ärger haben* does not mean ‘to have anger,’ but rather ‘to have trouble.’

32 We must note, however, that German *Ärger* also has meanings like annoyance, which English *anger* does not have.

In sum, in cases like the above-cited Greek words for “servant,” the lexical choice of the translator has to be determined by the distinction he makes in a particular context. Another type of distinction, which is not related to socio-cultural or world knowledge, is lexical choice between variants such as *skinny* versus *slim*. The explanation for such variation is found in the sphere of emotive meaning, which, in this case, is the only point of contrast between the meanings of the two words. The case of *skinny-slim* is discussed by Adrienne Lehrer (1974: 1-2), who analyzes the difference between these two words in terms of the speaker’s attitude toward the subject: unfavorable vs. neutral.

The degree of emotiveness, formality, generality, and intensity is also used in translation procedures such as those of Peter Newmark in reference to the definition of certain qualitative adjectives. Newmark, using componential analysis and an intensity

32 For a contrastive analysis of these words and other emotion vocabulary in different language, see the work of Edda Weigand, “The Vocabulary of Emotion: A Contrastive Analysis of ANGER in German, English, and Italian” (Weigand 1998: 45-66).
scale, registers the presence or lack of semantic components such as “shocking,” “sex,” “humor,” and “loudness” in the meaning of the adjectives bawdy, smutty, lewd, coarse, vulgar, indecent, and obscene, so that the points of contrast become evident to the translator (1980: 28-29).

Such componential analysis does not exclude the role of context in the process of the translator’s lexical selection. On the contrary, this role has been highly regarded and emphasized in many of the works that adopt the method of componential analysis. The most recent book on translation by the renowned Biblical scholar and proponent of componential semantics, Eugene Nida (2001), is, in fact, dedicated to the central role of context in understanding the meaning of words. Nida analyzes the semantic extension of the meaning of the verb “run,” evident in various contexts such as “the play ran for three months,” “the bill ran to sixty dollars,” “the plane runs every hour,” “he ran two thousand copies of the book,” etc. Looking at the great variety of contexts of “run,” Nida suggests that, “instead of treating ‘run’ as having a hundred or so meanings, with different words in the context pointing to the right meaning, it seems much better to regard the appropriate lexical unit as consisting of the verb ‘run’ plus the context.” In other words, “it would appear much more realistic to combine the verb run and the context into a ‘semantic molecule’” (Nida 2001: 33). With regard to translation, he adds that “the context not only determines how a word is to be understood, but also how it is to be translated” (Nida 2001: 35).

No matter whether we favor the “semantic molecule” definition or not, Nida’s arguments about the crucial role of context in the lexical semantics of words are convincing. I offer additional arguments, elaborating on the effect of the context on
lexical semantics, which are relevant for my own analysis of the lexical variation in the *Thekara*.

D. A. Cruse, in his textbook on lexical semantics, discovers two fundamental ways in which the context affects the meaning. The first one is “contextual modulation,” namely, that a “single sense can be modified in an unlimited number of ways by different contexts, each context emphasizing certain semantic traits and obscuring or suppressing others.” The second one is what he calls “contextual selection,” which is “the activation by different contexts of different senses associated with ambiguous word forms” (Cruse 1989: 52). Both of these contextual effects on meaning are present in any translation activity. They must also be part of any analysis that aims to interpret various translation practices that result in lexical variation in the translation. On a more concrete level of semantic analysis, two separate terms associated with “contextual modulation” are introduced by Cruse (1989: 53): “the relative *highlighting* and *backgrounding* of semantic traits.” One example he provides is the word “car”:

1. We can’t afford that car (*price*).
2. Our car couldn’t keep up with his (*performance*).
3. The car crushed Arthur’s foot (*weight*).

In all of these instances, the extralinguistic entity or the referent of the word “car” is the same; what differs are the attributes of the referent that are highlighted.

Another factor for understanding the motivation of semantic signification is the existence of words in collocations, or “lexical items which habitually co-occur, but which
are nonetheless fully transparent in the sense that each lexical constituent is also a semantic constituent” (Cruse 1989: 40). With regard to determining semantic domains some scholars note that “the fact that a particular set of items all collocate with a certain item may provide a clue to some common property they share” (Barnwell 1974: 27). Eugene Nida and Charles Taber, on the other hand, take a different perspective in their analysis of lexical semantics in collocations. They claim that, “from the habitual associations in the collocation green with envy, green undoubtedly picks up some unfavorable features of emotive meaning” (Nida and Taber 1974: 94).

The concept of “contextual selection,” together with the phenomenon of the speakers’ attitude (emotiveness), will help us understand another problem of semantic signification, namely, the use of different lexical means to denote the same referent. Consider the words policeman, officer, and cop; all have the same referent, but they can be used by the same speaker in different contexts or by different speakers in the same context. Here we touch upon a vast area of possible sociolinguistic and linguistic factors for the above-cited lexical variants, some of which could be the social background of the speaker, the gender of the speaker, dialectal vs. standard usage, anachronistic vs. contemporary usage, circumstances of usage (the setting), etc. An essential part of the motivation for using one word instead of another is the highlighting of specific features or characteristics of the designated person, which could be a result of the linguistic context and register or of the emotive dimension of the speaker’s message (regardless of his social background, gender, dialect, etc.). Consider, for example, a sentence like “I heard that the mayor of New York honored one of the NYPD officers/*policemen/*cops for his good work,” where the context and perhaps the very formal-sounding collocation
with “honor” play a role in the lexical selection. A case where emotiveness plays a role would be the lexical choice between *policeman* and *cop*, just as in the case of *slim-skinny*, discussed in a previous paragraph, with the difference that *cop* is not necessarily negative in American English.

What are the implications of the above-outlined problems in lexical semantics for the area of translation? Since we are dealing with semantic signification in two languages, we must address the types of transfer that take place during the translation process.\(^\text{33}\) What, then, could be the factors for such a transfer that results in a different lexical choice in the target language rendering a single lexeme in the source language?

Consider the following example of the English translation of Luke 15:12 found in the Revised Standard Version and the New English Bible (quoted in Nida and Taber 1974):

\[
\text{Luke 15:12}
\]

‘And he divided his **living**’ (*RSV*)

‘So he divided his **estate**’ (*NEB*)

An analysis of these different translations is undertaken by Nida and Taber:

Though ‘living’ is a literal rendering of Greek *bios*, it is misleading in present-day English, for ‘living’ would refer to ‘income’ and not to one’s entire estate. The NEB rendering is basically not a matter of style but of correctness in rendering, based on the principle of dynamic equivalence and not on the principle of formal correspondence (Nida and Taber 1974: 137).

\(^\text{33}\) I do not distinguish here between the different psycholinguistic theories and models of the mechanisms of bilingual signification. I adopt the concept of “transfer” to refer to the fact that we are dealing with semantic signification in *translation* in contrast to semantic signification in *one language*. 
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In a similar fashion, the two authors analyze other passages from the Bible translated into English. Their contribution is an attempt to devise a classification of the mechanisms of transfer between two languages that are chronologically and culturally distant. Most of the mechanisms they describe are on the level of stylistics (“the elimination of pleonasm,” “semantic simplicity,” “connotative effectiveness,” etc.); others are matters of interpretation (influenced by specific connotations of the biblical language) or of finding the appropriate referent. Their classification, however, suffers from too much generalization and from the use of randomly chosen labels to explain what occurs in the process of transfer. Nevertheless, the relevance of their study is their focus on various types of lexical variation in English translations of the Greek Bible, which appear to be “special cases” of translations. This special role of the biblical translations is due not only to the particular registers of the biblical discourse, but also to the additional dimensions of meaning in the lexical semantics – namely, those meanings specifically related to Christianity, its theology and ritual. In order to provide the necessary background for the present study, I will outline the problems of biblical translation in the next section.

2.2. Biblical semantics and translation

The approach to translation authored by the biblical scholar Eugene Nida and his collaborators has been quite influential among theoreticians and practitioners of

---

34 The distinctive nature of biblical translation has been recognized in works such as Nida and Taber 1974, Nida 1975, Nida and Louw 1992, Nida 2001, Silva 1983; Porter and Hess 1999; Tov 1999; and many others.
translations, both biblical and non-biblical. It attracts attention with its clearly defined translation program and practical advice for translators. Nida has been much influenced by Noam Chomsky and his generative approach to syntax and thus tries to incorporate some of the principles of transformational grammar into his own translation theory and practice. At the same time, he adopts the structuralist approach to meaning when he deals with lexical semantics.

First and foremost, Nida and Louw insist on recognizing "the fundamental indeterminacy of lexical meaning," which is manifested in the typical semantic problems of multiple meanings, fuzzy boundaries, overlapping semantic areas and theological controversies (Nida and Louw, eds. 1992: 121). Just as in any language, the meaning of some of the Greek words in the New Testament is very specific (τὸξον, ‘bow’ as a ribbon), while other words can have different meanings, e.g., πνεύμα, ‘the Holy Spirit,’ ‘an evil spirit,’ ‘a ghost,’ ‘the inner being of a person,’ ‘a way of thinking,’ ‘wind,’ ‘and ‘breath.’ Adjectives which pertain to characteristics are also difficult to analyze, as in the case of πειθωτός, which can appear in different contexts and may signify ‘genuine,’ ‘physically perfect,’ ‘complete,’ ‘mature,’ ‘adult’ or ‘initiated’ (Nida and Louw, eds. 1992: 4).

The authors find especially confusing for analysis cases where a word has acquired a highly restricted meaning with reference to Christian practices. They provide the example of the Greek ἀγάπη, “which regularly means love but in some contexts it designates a fellowship meal in which early Christians participated” (Nida and Louw, eds. 1992: 6).
The essence of Nida’s approach to lexical semantics is contained in the following description of words:

Words are only vehicles for carrying semantic features and what matters are these features, for example, the English ‘heir’ and the corresponding Greek κληρονόμος have in certain contexts the distinctive semantic features of 1) a person 2) who receives something (normally valuable) 3) provided by someone else 4) through legal or quasilegal means and 5) usually after the death of the provider. Some features of meaning are obligatory while others are optional (Nida and Louw, eds. 1992: 9).

The problem for such an analysis is to determine which features are obligatory and which are optional. What makes particular features obligatory in a certain context? Why do we have various English (or other) translations for one and the same Greek word? Is it because the features of the source word and the target word do not coincide or are in different configurations? With regard to the “matching” between features of words in two languages, the semantic components resemble to a great extent semantic fields, where the difference in translation is viewed not as a result of different numbers of semantic distinctions in both languages, but as making this distinction at different points within the lexical field (MacRobert 1993: 263).

However, Nida’s treatment of components differs with regard to the different parts of speech. When he analyses the semantic components of verbs, they all seem to be obligatory and, moreover, ordered in a specific way; cf. the Greek verb μετανοέω, ‘to repent,’ which is said to contain “three significant features which have an historically ordered sequence: 1) a presuppositional feature of having done something wrong, 2) a core feature of contrition about such an event, and 3) a crucial inferential component of a future way of life which will not repeat the wrong behavior” (Nida and Louw 1992: 101).
Thus, if we compare this analysis with Nida and Louw’s analysis of *heir* cited above, we see that, with verbs, one must account for the particular sequential order of components, which is not necessarily true for the semantic structure of nominal vocabulary. One may also notice the similarity of approaches to verbal vocabulary between the proponents of “feature semantics” and the proponents of “frame semantics” (a purely cognitive framework). Nida’s interpretation of *repent* is done, to a large extent, in a Fillmorean manner. In frame semantics, the narrative dimension in, e.g., the *commercial transaction* frame is emphasized through the succession “one person acquires control or possession of something from a second person, by agreement, as a result of surrendering to that person a sum of money” (Fillmore and Atkins 1992: 78-79). Similarly, the ‘repent’ analysis of Nida and Louw emphasizes the events prior or leading to “contrition” and the results of the “contrition.” In both the *commercial transaction* frame and the case of *repent*, it is impossible to change the order of the semantic constituents without changing the meaning of the words.

Such a difference in treatment between nominal and verbal vocabulary highlights the difficulties in approaching the lexicon in a unified manner. Thus, notwithstanding my and other scholars’ objections to the binary nature and the arbitrary assignment of features in feature semantics, componential analysis proves efficient in certain cases of semantic distinction – cases of related meanings of different lexical units. In my study, I modify this method by talking about the “focus” on points of contrast or similarity in the

35 The founder of frame semantics, Charles Fillmore, defines frames as “specific unified frameworks of knowledge, or coherent schematizations of experience” (quoted in Ungerer and Schmid 1996: 209).

36 For a sound criticism of feature semantics, see Bell 1991: 90.
lexical selection of the Slavic translators, instead of discussing the presence or absence (deletion) of particular semantic components responsible for the lexical variation in the translation.

In semantic analyses of biblical language, especially when dealing with lexical choices, there are factors that pertain exclusively to the realm of theology. Among the many studies of biblical semantics, the work of Silva devotes special attention to some of the pitfalls of lexical approaches to theology: the exaggerated estimate of etymological studies; the “illegitimate totality transfer” (assuming a word bears all its possible meanings in a given context); the inappropriate importing of a meaning, discovered elsewhere in the Bible, into a particular passage; concentration on individual words, which seldom leads to the very important examination of semantically related terms; and the most significant flaw, the confusion of the word for the reality (Silva 1983: 25-26). With respect to the last flaw, Silva (1983: 31) stresses that taking the obligatory role of the immediate context of a passage into account should be one of the goals of biblical semantics. This factor has been already discussed in the previous sections of this chapter.

One important distinction, which is extremely relevant for any study done solely on written sources such as the Bible, is that between language as a system and the written language that is present in written texts. Silva argues that lexical use is, to a great extent, a matter of the writer’s choice (idiolect), which nonetheless is limited by the lexical structure of the writer’s own language and, in particular, by the restrictions imposed by language regularity (Silva 1983: 66-67). Furthermore, style is significant for resolving semantic ambiguity; thus Silva suggests treating style as a component of meaning (Silva 1983: 148-157).
Style is also an important component in translation techniques and, in particular, in the translator’s choice of lexical equivalents. In written texts such as the Bible and its later interpretations by the Church Fathers, the lexical choice in translations from Greek should be interpreted from the perspective of faithfulness not only to the meaning in the original but also to the style of the original. Often, a translator made his lexical choice in order to comply with certain rhetorical figures in the Greek text, for example, *figura etymologica*. Thus, when we analyze medieval Slavic translations from Greek, we must account for different dimensions of meaning transfer. An excellent study of such dimensions is done by Emanuel Tov on the language of the Septuagint. There he recognizes three dimensions of meaning of words: the meaning intended by the Greek translator(s) of the Hebrew; the meanings attributed to the same words in the writings of the Church Fathers; and the meaning in the translations made of the Septuagint such as the Medieval Latin one (Tov 1999: 85). Making such a distinction is mandatory in any work that deals with medieval translations, including late medieval Slavonic translations. As I show in my analysis of lexical variation in the Slavonic translation of the *Thekara*, there is a complex and dynamic relation between the lexical choices of the *Thekara’s* translators, the meaning and usage of particular Slavonic vocabulary in the early translations of biblical texts and their later redactions, as well as in the writings of the Church Fathers (observed in the collection of sermons and homilies of *Codex Suprasliensis* and in later redactions of homiletic writings), and finally, in other non-biblical types of texts, contemporary to the translation of the *Thekara*.

In conclusion, the discussion of the peculiarities of biblical semantics in translation has shown that a study of the lexical variation in medieval Slavonic
translations of monastic compilations from Greek must bring together three different areas of human knowledge: linguistics (lexical semantics, in particular), translation studies (focusing on semantic equivalents, in particular), and biblical studies. As Nida and Louw note (1992: 18), “The Hellenistic Greek of the New Testament should be treated by essentially the same techniques as can and should be applied to any language, while at the same time recognizing the restricted nature of the vocabulary and the special purpose of communication.”

2.3. Non-unified model of lexical semantics

Before I offer a detailed account of my approach to the complex phenomena of the nature and factors for lexical variation, I will summarize the highlights of a proposal recently made by the Italian scholar Patrizia Violi in response to the existing semantic frameworks in linguistics. My argument is that Violi’s approach helps to explain heterogeneous lexical data and to justify the variety of lexical choices and thus offers valuable insight into the area of lexical semantics in translation, in general, and for the approach of the present study, in particular.

The non-unified model of lexical semantics proposed by Violi (2001) is informed by the current approaches to lexical semantics in three main frameworks – truth-functional semantics, structural semantics, and cognitive semantics – as well as by various semiotic theories. Violi recognizes the validity of each of these frameworks in interpreting various dimensions in the structure of meaning: intralinguistic, cognitive, and
extralinguistic. She attends to the function of each dimension and the significance of the framework describing it.

The “intralinguistic dimension,” according to Violi relates to the differences and variety within the lexicon. It is the object of study of structural semantics, which is “fundamental for explaining the reciprocal semantic determination of terms” (Violi 2001: 44).

The “cognitive dimension” accounts for the relations between lexical structure and conceptual organization, where “conceptual organization includes our set of comprehension processes and also the structure of our knowledge about the world” (Violi 2001: 44). Violi warns against assuming a one-to-one relation between “lexical categories” and “conceptual categories” and gives the example of “lexical gaps.” In this respect, she agrees with Fillmore’s distinction between “deep conceptual schemata” and their “lexical inscription” (Violi 2001: 45).

Finally, the most controversial point, as Violi states it, is the “extralinguistic dimension” – “that is, the relation between language and world.” Violi perceives the world as a “non-linguistic universe, namely, the experiential content to which language refers.” In her view, “the relation between language and the world is mediated by experience, especially perceptual experience in the case of [the] physical world … and language’s indexicality occurs crucially through perception.” One convincing example of such thinking is her definition of the meaning of sour, “which is something more than

37 These are terms that Violi uses, which loosely correspond to “lexical relations and configurations” (intralinguistic dimension); “conceptual frames, events or schemata” (cognitive dimension); and “semiotic or iconic relations” (extralinguistic dimension).
‘not sweet’ or ‘not salty.’” She insists that, “therefore, the model should assume a radically encyclopedic dimension.” Her conclusion is that

the three-part division is somewhat artificial because the intralinguistic, the cognitive-inferential and the deictic-referential dimensions are integrated and related to each other. Language is not a system closed in on itself; its semantics rests on our experience of the world and constantly relates to it. For this reason, every theory of meaning must necessarily also be a theory of human experience (Violi 2001: 48).

Since the extralinguistic dimension is the one that is the least studied in the translation literature, I consider some of Violi’s ideas related to the experiential dimension in the structure of meaning. Some of these ideas are taken into consideration in my study on lexical variation in translation.

One of Violi’s main arguments with regard to the format of semantic representation is that one must refer to two types of competence: referential and inferential (Violi 2001: 174). “Inferential competence” is said to be based on “the extensive network of connections between words that the competent speaker has access to, and his or her knowledge that, for example, roses are flowers...” (Violi 2001: 174).

“Referential competence,” on the other hand, is defined as “the speaker’s ability to ‘map’ lexical terms onto the world and thus to use linguistic expressions appropriately in order to refer to world entities, to identify specific object among others.” Violi provides examples of artifacts such as telephone, where “the identification of the referent is often much more than just a matter of pure perceptual recognition.” The referential ability with regards to artifacts “implies a complex interaction between perceptual and functional recognition.” Violi claims that the referential competence is the one through
which “we can explain the ability to distinguish between a real phone and a fake one, which has all the perceptual features of a real one but does not allow us to make calls” (Violi 2001: 178).

Violi includes the “perceptual field” in her typology of the forms of experience, together with the “social field” and the “psychic-emotive field” (Violi 2001: 221). “Perception” in her model is defined as “one of the most significant possible parameters of variation in the structuring of the semantic system such as the opposition between concrete and abstract.” With regard to the semantic classification of the lexicon, Violi views the role of perceptual experience as “lying along a continuum; at one extreme are terms for whose semantics the perceptual dimension is an essential component, and at the other extreme terms which relate to abstract schemata.” As examples of the former she gives “natural kinds” or what she calls “natural actions” (predicates like run, jump, etc.), adjectives indicating taste, smells, tactile sensations, etc. (Violi 2001: 221). Violi concludes that “all these cannot be described without reference to the particular perceptual experience that motivates them” (Violi 2001: 222).

Furthermore, Violi makes the generalization that “all vocabulary, which refers to a phenomenology of perceptual-corporeal experience, has analogous characteristics, in so far as it possesses an indexical dimension that relates to non-linguistic experience.” However, she recognizes some differences between the semantic structure of the lexical class of natural kinds and that of man-made artifacts. “The natural kinds reflect saliencies, which are exclusively perceptual; terms for artifacts refer to saliencies that are both perceptual and functional (and in addition, the latter ones can be also culturally bound)” (Violi 2001: 222).
A relevant question for my study concerns the status of abstract vocabulary such as terms for fear, success, suffering, joy, etc. In a monastic text such as the Thekara compilation, most of the vocabulary pertains to such an abstract level, as represented in the emotion words, words for psychological states, and others. How then does Violi approach such vocabulary? She states that “the boundaries of the corresponding conceptual categories of words like honor, respect, good, and love are extremely fuzzy … The prototype is in these cases highly idiosyncratic and closely linked to individual experiences of the structuring of a given concept” (Violi 2001: 224). The fundamental question is, “How can we know, when talking about pain, happiness, anguish, or love, that we all understand the same things?” (Violi 2001: 225). Similarly, an evaluative expression such as good book “involves utterly heterogeneous parameters. A book can be judged to be good because it is fun, useful, informative, well written, well bound, and so on. But even if it were possible to reach provisional agreement on the parameters, their identification would always be unavoidably tied to individual judgment” (Violi 2001: 224). This is the reason why Violi introduces the next dimension of lexical meaning, the “axiological.”

The “axiological dimension” of lexical meaning is the “attribution of values of various kinds to the lexical configuration. This is perhaps one of the most difficult areas to grasp, given the inherent haziness of the concepts of value and valorization” (Violi 2001: 231). Violi rejects the use of the old concept of connotation as being “ambiguous and liable to cause confusion.” She introduces two views on valorization: it is either based on “collective appreciation and social opinion,” à la Hjelmslev, or “rooted in the corporal perception of the subject,” à la Greimas. The latter introduces the special
“thymic” category, which, according to Violi, accounts for such variation as *skinny-slim*. By referring to the essence of the “thymic” category as being composed of the contrasting pair *euphoria/dysphoria*, she views this category as “having an essential role in the transformation of semantic microuniverses into axiologies” (Violi 2001: 233). She adds that this category is not an additional, superimposed dimension of meaning; “at the basis of meaning itself, there is an initial attribution of values that are not meanings but emotions and sensations connected with the most elementary and deep levels of our perceptual organization, such as corporeal perception” (Violi 2001: 233). For Greimas, according to Violi’s interpretation, “the thymic is a precondition of meaning and its priority is ontological, in relation to the very possibility of meaning” (Violi 2001: 237). Thus, “the thymic cannot be interpreted as an idiosyncratic system of valorization”; it is the “intentionality made up of emotions and sensations rooted in our corporeal, perceptual, and psychic organization and in the valencies, which color our world with values, affects, attraction, and repulsion” (Violi 2001: 237).

In these terms, Violi diverges from the traditional connotation model as a means of explaining the variation *skinny-slim* because “the connotations are superimposed, not innate, properties of meaning” (Violi 2001: 236). In her model, *valorization* is viewed as “a primary element of semantic organization, not a secondary meaning that could be erased, and is conveyed by specific semes, pathemic semes” (Violi 2001: 236).

Violi validates the explanatory value of her concept of “pathemic semes” in a discussion about the differences between a *violent blow* and a *painful blow*. She derives the axiology of the pathemic component of the meaning of the lexical units from “an element that could be called enunciative perspectivization. In the case of ‘violent blow,’
the blow is oriented according to the perspective of the person who inflicts it, in the case of ‘painful blow’ – it is oriented to the person who receives it” (Violi 2001: 236). Similar to (but independent of) Violi’s argument for the valorization component of meaning is Fillmore’s discussion of the expressions good food-good feed (Fillmore 2003: 161). He brings up this specific case of variation “as evidence for the linguistic validity of ‘evaluative features.’” These features, he argues, are the only distinctions we can make between the above-listed expressions, since they both refer to the same objects but in a different way: palatable and nutritious respectively. According to Fillmore, “such a pair would provide a good argument for the existence of evaluative features as an aspect of linguistic competence” (Fillmore 2003: 161).

Violi’s argument, on the other hand, that “pathemic aspects can often be found at a lexical level,” rests on cases of variation between qualifying adjectives such as frightening, terrifying, and terrible (Violi 2001: 236). The distinctions that she makes and the introduction of the concept of “pathemic semes” can be exploited further in a study of lexical variation such as the present dissertation. In some cases, such as the variation δικαίος - παθητικός for the Greek δικαίον (‘injustice’), the use of different lexical units in the Slavonic translation to refer to the same concept represented through the Greek word in the original cannot be explained by simply referring to different connotations, because the semantic fields of the Slavonic words overlap substantially. Rather, we can say that, in the case of δικαίος, the “injustice” is oriented or focused towards the person who does it (or inflicts it), while in the case of παθητικός, it is oriented to the person who receives the “injustice” or “insult.” Thus, in this lexical variation the enunciative perspectivization
based on the axiological level of meaning is the only one that could account for the difference between the meanings of ἁγιασμός and ἁγία.

Another significant area where, in Violi’s opinion, we can verify the role of the axiological or evaluative level of meaning is that of metaphor (Violi 2001: 237). We see that, as in the above-cited case of ἁγιασμός and ἁγία, in the Slavonic translation of the Thekara there can be cases of two different metaphors that both render one and the same Greek metaphor. The mechanisms or the paths that were taken by the Slavic translators in order to arrive at a metaphor-equivalent to the Greek one can be understood only if we refer to the evaluative level of meaning.

In sum, Violi’s non-unified model of lexical semantics has been influenced by some of the contemporary theories of meaning, and to a great degree, by the French semiotic framework of Greimas. Violi’s contribution to the present study comes mostly from her focus on perceptional recognition and the axiological dimension of meaning as two significant ways of looking at meaning. Recognizing the heterogeneity of the semantic frameworks, which corresponds to the heterogeneity of the lexicon, Violi addresses important distinctions in our approaches to semantic signification in relation to referential and inferential competence, conceptual categories, the phenomenology of experience, and valorization.

Her elaborate approach to all of these dimensions of meaning has its roots (although from a different perspective) in such earlier works as Roman Jakobson’s analysis of the six functions of language: referential, aesthetic, emotive, conative, phatic, and metalingual. Jakobson’s work has been adopted in some works on translation, such
as that of Nida (1975: 201), who claims that “meaning must be understood primarily in terms of the functions performed by various factors in communication. Jakobson’s classification … remains basic to an understanding of meaning.” The point of similarity between Nida’s interpretation of Jakobson’s functions and Violi’s approach is their perspective on the emotive function (Nida) or dimension (Violi) of language: “The emotive function involves primarily the attitudes of the source, but this function can be described for certain communication as ‘evaluative’ or ‘appraisive’” (Nida 1975: 201).

Newmark (1980: 23-24) also tries to classify meanings by describing “varieties of general meaning, which are all interrelated: linguistic, referential, subjective, the ‘force’ or ‘intention’ of the utterance, the ‘performative,’ the inferential, the cultural, the code meaning, the connotative, the pragmatic and the semiotic.” He also acknowledges that, in the process of translation, “the translator has to detect and assess evaluative language, which expresses the source language text author’s or readers’ of his peer group’s explicit or implicit value-judgments.” He provides examples of words of vague (evaluative) meaning such as good, fair, terrible, etc., which are vague only “until they are placed on a scale.” Other words, such as stupid and judicious are viewed by him as “partly evaluative and partly informative” (Newmark 1980: 120).

2.4. Interpreting lexical variation: the approach of this study

The direction taken in the present study in relation to meaning in lexical variation in translation has its grounds both in the linguistic approaches to meaning and the semantic orientation of certain translation studies. In the last section of this chapter, I
offer a full account on my own approach to the lexical variation in the Slavonic translation of the Greek *Thekara*.

The first issue to address is what is meant here by “lexical variation.” In this study lexical variation refers to the different lexical choices (involving different words) made by the Slavic translators in their translation of the Greek compilation of the *Thekara*. It is imperative to note that these lexical choices are made in one and the same context; that is, in a certain passage we find in different manuscript copies two different Slavonic words representing one and the same Greek word, for example:

1. S ὅτι ἁμαρτον ὅ τῶν ἁθέτων μου πράξεων ἀριθμὸς, 52v (lines 24-25)  
   ‘Because my wicked deeds are innumerable’

   α) εἰς ἔμπροσθεν ἐς ἐνέργειαυ μοί ἄνθρωπον ένσις, 4r (lines 2-3)

   β) εἰς ἔμπροσθεν ἐς ἐνέργειαυ μοί ἄνθρωπον ένσις, 14r (lines 11-12)38

The passage presents a clear-cut case of simple lexical variation, with no signs of restructured word order or morphosyntax. The passage is also representative of most types of lexical variation in the Slavonic translation of the *Thekara*, where we witness a relatively literal rendering of the Greek text, meant to preserve the word order of the source text. Such faithful translations were common in Slavonic medieval literature, particularly in its early stage of translations of the Gospels, Apostle, Psalter and other major biblical texts, when the newly-developed Glagolitic and the subsequent Cyrillic alphabets served as vehicles for carrying the Byzantine mission of offering the Slavs biblical texts in their own language. Several centuries later, when the translation of the

---

38 The different lexical choices in the Slavonic versions α and β are underlined.
Thekara was carried out, similar problems emerged, problems related to the highly literary and formal nature of the text of the Thekara. The Slavonic translation of this text demonstrates the felicitous rendering of the Greek syntax (word order and grammatical relations) but at the same time, the inventive and interpretative work of the Slavic translators in the area of vocabulary. There they allowed themselves some freedom in making different lexical choices to render a given Greek word. They did this by relying heavily on the immediate context of the word in question, their own perception of intra- and interlinguistic semantic relations, and intertextual (Christian) references.

The focus of this study is not lexical semantics per se, but the lexical choices of translators reflected in the variants in the Slavonic text. My research method is inductive, in that I allow the data to guide me to the interpretation. Consider the following variation between the participles from the verbs ἀποξόουσαι (‘to stink’) and εὐφράσιμαι (‘to do,’ ‘to accomplish’) for the Greek ἀποζύζωσαί (from ἀποζύζω, ‘to smell’) in the following passage:

2. Σ ώς δούλος δισφόταις υποτάξομαι ταίς ἡδοναῖς, ταίς δισφοίν καὶ ἁμαρτίας ὑμην ἀποξόουσαις. 66r (lines 1-3)

‘And like a slave [is subject to his] master, I am subject to pleasures, which stink with bad and sinful smell’

α ιακο ἠπελ ζαίτε πολιτίς σε σλαστή, ἔνεε χασιμπάζει η γρώπην κονέ σιμπλαζή. 15r (lines 19-21)

β ιακο ηαπελ ζαίτε πολιτίς σε σλαστή, χασιμπάζεια η γρώπην κονέ σιμπλαζή. 23v (lines 4-5)

An interpretation of this variation could be carried out simply by listing the primary and secondary meanings of both verbs. However, a more sophisticated approach will attend to
the linguistic realization of the meaning ‘to smell’ in the case of ἐκβάλλω together with the existential properties of this vacuous verb, which are salient or in focus in this particular case. This realization is what allows us to interpret both lexical choices in versions α and β against the background of one and the same conceptual frame, that of ‘sensation.’ Note, however, that such an interpretation of the nature of these substitutes is tied to the context in which they appear. The context is what establishes the conceptual frame of ‘sensation,’ through which the elements ἀληθεύει (the agent) and ὄψις (the direct object) are put into focus in order to realize this particular conceptual frame.

This example of lexical variation shows the variety of semantic signification done in the Slavonic translation in order to render the Greek word. The verbs ἐκβάλλω and ἀγόρασθη are not substitutes in any other contexts but this particular one; they operate somewhat analogously to the English verbs get and buy in the sentence “Did you get/buy the newspaper today?” One of the verbs is very general and covers many different conceptual frames, while the other is very specific. Ultimately, it is the context that makes it possible for the frame of the vacuous verb to be interpreted against the frame of the specific verb as synonyms.

Defining synonymy in natural languages is a difficult enterprise, as everyone working in the field of lexical semantics is aware. For example, in his standard textbook on semantics, Cruse lists two main criteria for defining synonyms:

39 For an analysis of these verbs within frame semantics and the Fillmore’s commercial transaction frame in particular, see Violi 2001: 193-194.
Synonyms must have a significant degree of semantic overlap, as evidenced by common semantic traits. For example, *truthful* and *honest* fall within our broad class of synonyms and have a relatively high semantic overlap…. However, it does not follow that the more semantic traits a pair of words share, the more synonymous they are. The key lies in the nature of the differentiating characteristics (Cruse 1989: 266).

Cruse’s conclusion (1989: 267) is that “synonyms are lexical items whose senses are identical with respect to ‘central’ semantic traits, but differ, if at all, only with respect to what we may provisionally describe as ‘minor’ or ‘peripheral traits.’” The problem with such a definition is that it is circular: synonyms are defined through “central” and “minor” semantic traits without a proper definition of these traits; furthermore, these traits are used to prove that certain lexical items are synonyms.

More appropriate for our study is classification as W.E. Collinson’s, given in Silva’s book (1983: 123). Collinson’s schema uses nine criteria of possible relations between synonyms: generality (*refuse/reject*), intensity (*repudiate/refuse*), emotivity (*reject/decline*), approbation (*thrifty/economical*), technicality (*decease/death*), literary level (*passing/death*), colloquialism (*turn down/refuse*), geographical variation (*Scots flesher/butcher*), child-talk (*daddy/father*). It seems that this scheme mixes different levels of representation and is concerned more with the types of lexical variation within a language than with synonymy. I would say that synonymy is only a type of lexical variation. Furthermore, in my study I analyze synonyms such as κράζωμαι and είμαι for the Greek στενάγμος (‘groaning,’ ‘sigh’) by finding the points of contrast between them – in the present case, the scale of intensity of emotions and the related observable physiological expression of these emotions: ‘groan’ (continuous) vs. ‘sigh’ (instantaneous). Such contrast, which is obvious from the different contexts of usage of
both nouns, is based on perception and valorization. In monastic literature such (near-)
synonyms are common phenomena; they appear to be fully interchangeable in most contexts, and they render the nuances of the Greek word with a high level of accuracy.

From the two examples of lexical variation cited above, it is clear that my analysis looks at both the syntagmatic relations among the Slavonic variants and their semantic motivation in reference to the Greek source word. Such a complex description of meaning is further complicated by the nature of the data with which I am working. The data do not allow the use of a single manner of description or interpretation of the differences between the lexical variants in the Slavonic translation. Some of the lexical items have a clear referent with regard to function or perceptual characteristics; others are a complex conceptualization of abstractions (emotion vocabulary); and still others are based on various associations between different concepts (metaphors and metonyms). Thus, my approach is a mixture of explanatory procedures that aims to account for the mechanisms of translation and the potential of the lexical means utilized by the translators.

The specifics of the texts I am working with add yet another dimension to my interpretation of the lexical variation in translation – the Biblical dimension. I have already discussed in the previous chapter the peculiarities of biblical translations; it is these peculiarities that make the present study different from any other study on translation. In particular, the text for analysis is different from the texts of the Psalter or the Gospel, for example, in the fact that it is a compilation of prayers and hymns, based on either direct citations or allusions to the Psalter, the Gospel, the Apostle, and the monastic Pandects. This situation is commonly referred to as “intertextuality,” in which
the meaning of the words is not constituted only within the text itself. It has “pointers” or references to words and concepts in other texts. Furthermore, the Slavonic translation of such “intertextual” semantics also points to other previous Slavonic translations in a way in which, in some cases, we witness some formulas or imagery that have already been stabilized in the memory of the Slavonic translators of the Thekara. Consider, for example, the following passage:

3. S παρ’ ἑλπίδα τεῦξιμαι ἀθανάτων κολάσεων, 56r (lines 25-26)-56v (line 1) ‘Contrary to hope, I will receive eternal punishment/suffering’
α ἥν ἡδεξιάς πολλὴν ἔεκληματικὴν ἐμκλῆ, 7r (line 3)
β ἥν ἡδεξιάς πολλὴν ἐκφθίη ἐμκλῆ, 16v (lines 15-16)

The translation in version α, ἔεκληματικὴν, is a structural calque of the Greek ἀθανάτων. As such, it appears to render the meaning of the Greek word not only with respect to this particular passage, but also with respect to the typical translation of the Greek ἀθανάτων in other texts. In other words, the translator of version α renders the meaning and the structure of the Greek language, not the formulaic imagery that it represents. The translation of version β, ἐκφθίη, on the other hand, is by no means a perfect translation equivalent of this particular Greek word, since it uses a word that is not commonly associated with the lexeme ἀθανάτων. What might have occurred here is a recollection of a formulaic expression, based on intertextual associations. Thus, the translator of β seemed to dispose of the obvious semantics of ἀθανάτων and instead, opted for a monastic topos triggered by his memory of other similar texts.
This complex process demands a more elaborate distinction of the various factors influencing the lexical selection of the Slavic translators with respect to the written tradition of Christian texts and the tradition of their translations in Slavonic. Therefore, we must consider the following factors: the specific meaning of the word in a particular passage from the Greek text of the *Thekara*; the tradition of this meaning (if any) in Greek biblical and patristic writings; the meaning of the particular lexical item in the Slavonic translation of the *Thekara*; and finally, the tradition of this meaning, in Slavonic translations of biblical and patristic writings.

One way to look at the formulas and *topoi* in monastic texts is to recall the concept of collocation, that is, the “tendency of certain words to co-occur regularly in a given language” (Baker 1992: 47). I briefly discussed in the previous section the role of collocations for establishing the points of similarity and contrast between the meanings of different words. I would like to add here that we should also be aware that the Christian dimension in the text for analysis in this study could activate semantic associations that are not typical for the habitually occurring collocations.

In sum, I have offered a detailed picture of both the theoretical and practical problems of interpreting lexical variation in translations. I have also discussed the parameters of my approach to the Greek and Slavonic data, which is prompted by the heterogeneous nature of this data. In the following four chapters, I will present my interpretation of various cases of lexical variation, which are discussed in terms of the focus on different factors for the lexical choices of the Slavic translators: polysemy, valorization, perceptual competence, and pragmatic inferentiality. Some of these factors are present in corpora-studies of lexical variation, such as Geeraerts, Grodelaers, and
Bakema’s (1994) study of alternative denominations of the same referents (clothing items); Lehrer’s (1974) study of sets of words (cooking vocabulary) and their patterning within a single lexical field; Weigand’s (1998) cross-linguistic (English, German and Italian) study of emotion vocabulary; and the collection of works by Altenberg and Granger on cross-linguistic equivalence in multilingual corpora and translations (2002).

However, due to the restricted nature and high register of the monastic texts, the data I extracted for my study clearly show a specific type of lexical variation, one that, for the most part, is based on subtle distinctions in the meaning of the words, observable through the syntagmatic relations between the Slavonic variants. Such distinctions are evidence of the creative translators’ work with the Greek text in terms of enunciating perceptional and evaluative features of meaning.
CHAPTER 3

SLAVONIC LEXICAL RESPONSES TO THE VARIATION IN THE GREEK MANUSCRIPT TRADITION

3.1. Preliminary remarks

As I already mentioned in Chapter 1, when we study lexical variation in the Slavonic translation of a Greek text, we have to be aware of the fact that there could be lexical variation in the Greek tradition as well. Such variation, therefore, could have been the basis for the Slavic lexical variation, a case which allows us to not look further into any semantic motivation.

This chapter presents three such cases where, apparently the Slavic translators of versions α and β have different Greek texts in front of them. Before I attend further to this matter, I will briefly discuss some of the differences between the Greek manuscripts on the lexical and the textual levels.

One common feature of monastic texts such as the Thekara (and other monastic texts such as monastic Pandects or the books of Church Law) is the presence of lists of sins and sinners – an expression of a particular type of mentality, self-derogatory. In the case of the Thekara, these lists vary in the different Greek manuscripts and in the printed edition. Such variation is quite normal. It could be due to the monk’s personal perception
of which sins are important and which should not to be included in the list; it could be also due to the large number of lexical items on the list, some of which could be easily omitted during the copyist’s work or listed in a different order.

The lists of sins and sinners pose problems for the analysis of the lexical semantics in the Slavonic translation because it is not necessarily clear which Greek word was the basis for the Slavonic lexical variants. From a methodological point of view, however, it is important to indicate the presence of such lists (probably quite common for monastic compilation texts), so that we recognize them as a factor in the Slavonic lexical variation and do not look further into the semantic differences among these words. An additional detail is that all of these lists are part of the prayers and not the hymns. This could also be indicative of genre characteristics – namely, that the prayers were more open to textual and lexical variations than hymns. This variation could be also the result of the personal occupations of the monks, who copied the prayers and read them in private, in their cells. We already mentioned in chapter one that the texts for communal use from the Thekara’s compilation were the hymns and the kathismas. Texts for communal reading, which were also part of the liturgy, were less prone to variation because of their established place in the liturgical tradition. This is precisely the situation we find in the Thekara, where the texts for private reading (mostly prayers) exhibit a greater amount of lexical variation, while the texts for communal reading (mostly hymns) show a lesser degree of variation.

Variations on the lexical-syntactic level are the omissions or additions of syntagmas that are parts of repetitive formulae. One such example is the formula Eleison me (‘Have mercy on me’) in some of the prayers, where we find some omissions or
additions in the different manuscripts. An explanation of this variation is based on the
syntactic parallelism of the sentences, which start with the same formula, “eleison me.”

On a textual level, the greatest difference within the Greek tradition, is the lack of
one of the prayers, εὐχὴ τοῖς αἰρουμένοις (ματέα ἡξελωμενοι in both Slavonic
versions) in manuscripts Sin 301, Panteleimon 5829, and Panteleimon 5895.

After these preliminary remarks on the variation within the Greek family of
manuscripts, I offer a tentative subdivision of the Greek manuscripts into two groups,
based on textual and lexical-syntactic differences. Certainly, for a detailed textological
study of the Greek tradition, more elaborate stemma of the relations between Greek
manuscripts is needed. However, such research is beyond the scope of this dissertation.

**Tentative subdivision of the Greek manuscripts:**

**Group 1**
- Sin. 269 (305), from GIM, parchment, 1341 = S
- Sin. 334 (306), from GIM, 16th century = S1
- Sin. 301 (307) from GIM, 16th century.
- Panteleimon 5895 (16th c.)
- Zographou 339 (17th c.) = Z
- Dionysiou 4005 (15th c.)

**Group 2**
- Dionysiou 4024 (15th c.)
- Dionysiou 4038 (15th c.)
- Dionysiou 3976 (15th c.)
- Philotheou 1925 (16th c.)
- Koutloumousiou 3409 (16th c.)
- Panteleimon 5829 (17th c.) = P1
- Panteleimon 5894 (17th c.) = P
- Iviron 4943 (17th c.)
- Docheiareiou 2916 (17th c.)
- Xeropotamou 2403 (16th c.)

'ΕΓΧΕΙΡΊΔΙΟΝ καλομένων ὈΗΚΑΡΑΣ Παρὰ Νικολάω Γλυκεί τῷ ἔξω Ἰωαννίων
(1783), printed in Venice.
3.2. Examples of Slavonic variation stemming from different Greek protographs

3.2.1.

S (Group 1)  óδε συγκατάβασις, ἐκείνη ἀκριβεία, 56v (lines 2-3)
P1 (Group 2) óδε συγκατάθεσις, ἐκείνη ἀκριβεία
“Here - agreement, there - precision”
α ζαν ολοκλείνει, ταμὸς οπασείν, 7r (line 5)
β ζε εὐχολείει, ταμὸς οπαστε, 16v (line 17)

This example shows in a compelling manner how the Greek tradition splits into two groups and how this split is reflected in the Slavic translations.

Group 1 has the reading συγκατάβασις, ‘going down together,’ ‘agreement’ while Group 2 has συγκατάθεσις, ‘agreement,’ ‘concord.’ The printed edition and Panteleimon 5894 are the only ones which do not have the paragraph with this particular passage in it.

The most interesting case is presented by the Greek Dionysiou 3976 (15th c.), where we find συγκατάθεσις and the letters βα written above θε of the word συγκατάθεσις. This is a rare example of manifest editorial work by the scribe, who has thereby managed to write both συγκατάθεσις and συγκατάβασις. If we take into account the situation in the other manuscripts from Group 1 and Group 2 as well as their chronology, we can explain the lexical variation in the Greek tradition in two ways:

1. The scribe of Dionysiou 3976 had in front of him manuscripts from both groups and thus decided to incorporate both readings in his manuscript. This explanation is based on the assumption that there were other manuscripts, earlier than Dionysiou 3976, where we find the reading συγκατάθεσις as an alternative to the συγκατάβασις
attested in Sin 269, so that the scribe of Dionysiou 3976 could have copied from both existing Greek traditions. Such manuscripts, unfortunately, are not extant.

2. The other explanation also takes into account the chronology of the manuscripts of Group 2 with the reading συγκατάθεσις, which are all dated at least a century later than Dionysiou 3976. In this case, it is very plausible that the scribe of Dionysiou 3976 initiated the lexical variation by editing συγκατάθεσις without deleting it, which is reflected in the manuscripts of Group 2.

Both these explanations would lead to the lexical variation in the Slavic texts, as an investigation of the Slavic words in the translation of Thekara will show. The word свежене in translation α means ‘creating’ or ‘creation,’ as in Matthew 25:34, са свежене векого мира (attested in Z, M, SK, and A), where свежене renders the Greek καταβολή (‘beginning,’ ‘creation’). The Slavonic word свежене is also attested as a translation of σύνθημα (‘agreement,’ ‘contract’), which is semantically and derivationally related to the Greek word in Group 2 of the Greek Thekara manuscripts, συγκατάθεσις. In the meaning of ‘agreement’ or ‘contract,’ the Slavonic word свежене is attested for σύνθημα only in Supr 319:7: το καινον σύνθεμα της ευρήνης, νεον εκ σλοжениех мира (‘the new foundation/agreement of peace’). The same meaning of ‘agreement’ is present in Thekara translation α, as a primary meaning of the Group 2 word συγκατάθεσις. Thus, I argue that the Slavonic word in translation α translated faithfully the Greek in Group 2.
Version β, on the other hand, by using the word συγκατάβασις, gives an accurate rendition of the word in Group 1, συγκατάβασις. The same word is attested for συγκατάβασις in Supr 303:17: συγκατάβασις σι ἐν ἡ προσήλωσίν ηλικίας ἡμών ἡμῶν ἦσαν καὶ τὰ ἱερά καὶ τὰ ἱδρύματα τῆς ἱερᾶς καὶ τῆς ἱδρύματος τῶν ἵστατον (Cejtlin et al., eds. 1994: 674), ‘there was prayer of the gathering [of people] and [there was] of those who came [to the gathering] because of weakness/illness.’ Thus, version β also renders the Greek word faithfully but only the word attested in Group 1.

Before I make my final comments on this cause of lexical variation, I would like to examine two other examples of Slavonic lexical variation based on two different Greek texts (reflecting two different manuscript groups):

3.2.2. Z (13v), S1 (14v) ένωσιν μου τὰς ἀνομίας μου
‘Before me my unjust deeds’
α πρὸς μήνα εξακολούθη μνήμη, 12r (line 1)

S (62r), P (18v) κατὰ πρόσωπόν μου τὰς ἁμαρτίας μου, (lines 9-10)
‘Before my face my sins’
β πρὸς ἄνθρωπον προκαλέσαι εξακολούθη μνήμη, 20v (line 17)

3.2.3. S (Group 1) μὴ εἰς ἄνεος φέρων, 62v (line 22)
‘not carrying in [my] thoughts’
α μὴ εἰς ἄνεος φέρα, 12v (lines 8-9)

P (Group 2) μὴ συνούμενος
‘not thinking’
β μὴ παρεμπεπτεῖ, 21r (line 19)

The lexical variation in the Greek tradition, exemplified by 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 does not cause major semantic changes; it is more a matter of expressing the same meaning in
two different (syntactic) ways. Thus, this particular difference cannot be perceived as a major divider of the Greek groups. However, it is significant for the situation in the Slavonic groups in that we can determine partially the manuscripts which were the basis of the two Slavonic translations or versions.

For the purposes of a future textological study of the Greek and the Slavonic manuscript tradition, we can use examples 3.2.1, 3.2.2, and 3.2.3 as cross-references to specify the particular Greek manuscripts that the Slavic translators of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) had as source texts. Such a study, however, is not particularly important for the analysis of the lexical variation in the Slavonic translation. All we should keep in mind is whether this lexical variation was based on one and the same source text or whether there were different Greek texts in front of the Slavic translators. Therefore, in the next four chapters, all examples of lexical variation in the Slavonic texts are carefully checked against every single Greek manuscript, in order to control for lexical variation in the Greek tradition. This procedure showed no traces of a second Greek text as a basis for the Slavonic variation.
CHAPTER 4

SLAVONIC DERIVATIONAL AND LEXICAL DOUBLETS

4.1 Preliminary remarks

The term ‘textological doublets’ is based on the definition of doublets as stated in Cejtlin’s Old Slavonic Dictionary:

Textological doublets are those that render in a different way one and the same word from the Greek (or Latin) original in a particular context of a particular written monument…Usually, textological doublets are at the same time lexical doublets, namely, words that have the same meaning; in polysemous words at least one of the meanings should be the same. Lexical doublets are different from synonyms, as the latter are close but not equal in their meaning’ (Cejtlin at al., eds. 1994: 54).

In her general work on the OCS vocabulary, Cejtlin compares ‘variants’ and ‘doublets’ by stating that “variants and doublets are phenomena of the same order”:

Variants are a subtype of doublets, but both are established on the basis of minimum one common meaning. Variants unlike doublets have also a common root. Genetically doublets belong to the system of literary language, variants to the system of dialect. Their co-existence in one
system gradually leads to a loss of the unnecessary member of the pair or to development of new semantic to stylistic features in the other member’ (Cejtlin 1986: 76).

Apparently, Cejtlin is using the term ‘variant’ in its narrow linguistic meaning and, thus defines only phonetic and derivational variants. However, doublets can be also semantic. Therefore, in my work I use the term ‘variant’ as related to ‘variation’ simply to refer to the existence of two different words in the two versions of the Slavonic translation of the *Thekara*.

According to Večerka, lexical (or translation) doublets made their way into OCS texts in two ways: 1) the doublets entered in the process of copying, revising and comparing the OCS texts with their Greek originals; 2) the doublets already existed in the original translations as a reflection of the translation techniques of the first translators. In regard to the written tradition of the Gospels, the Apostolic books, and the Psalter, Večerka favors the idea of lexical variants being present in the earliest development stages of OCS (Večerka 1997: 372). His general conclusion is that the three basic sources of lexical synonymy in OCS were synonymy in the Greek text, Slavonic regional lexical differences, and the possibility of translating one Greek expression in different ways.

However, in the *Thekara* most of the words recognized as doublets translate the same Greek word, but the contexts are different. How can we then draw a line between true doublets (full substitutes) and contextual doublets? It seems to me that what has been referred to as “doublets” in the existing literature has to do more with synonymy, which is just one type of possible relation between lexical doublets.
In this chapter I approach doublets as pairs of words having the ability to be in parallel distribution with all of their meanings, not just one. For this reason, a pair such as οκαμενής (‘hardening’) – ομαλκαμενής (‘darkening’) is not included in this chapter but in the chapter on imagery, since only in certain contexts and through particular metaphorical extensions can these two words be comparable.

Furthermore, we must differentiate between synchronic textological doublets and diachronic ones. The former type can be further divided into textological doublets in one and the same manuscript (for the same Greek word), which we will call ‘contextual doublets,’ and textological doublets in different copies of the same text that are from the same epoch. The diachronic type consists of mostly those doublets that reflect editorial work on the part of the scribe/editor, which is done for various reasons: disposing of archaic vocabulary, regional differences, deliberate redaction due to different translation principles, etc.

Finally, we need to distinguish between doublets that occur systematically in the Church Slavonic language and doublets that appear only in the context of Thekara. I analyze doublets by grouping them in two categories: derivational and lexical. The first category covers doublets that have the same root (or stem) but different prefixational and suffixational structure; in some cases, they can occur as different parts of speech. The second category, the largest one, includes words with different roots and derivational structure but with identical semantics.
4.2 Derivational doublets

4.2.1.
πῶς ἀπαρχύθητος ὁ κλαυθμός ἐκείνος καὶ ἀπαυστὸς 63r (lines 9-10)
‘How inexorable and unceasing is that weeping’
α  κακὸ ἄνευτωμίθ πλαῦ ὁ βάδερστάμενη, 12v (lines 19-20)
β  κακὸ ἄνευτωμίθ πλαῦ ἰ ἰβέρɛκτάμενη, 21v (lines 3-4)

In example 4.2.1, the translation of the word ἀπαυστὸς in this passage exemplifies a common variation in Slavonic derivational means between the prefixes ἰ and ἐζ. Clearly, the lexical variation in this particular passage is of derivational rather than semantic significance. The Slavic translators of α and β both used structural calques as responses to the Greek ἀπαυστὸς (‘unceasing’), but each Slavonic version gave preference to a different prefix (ἰ in α and ἐζ in β) in order to convey the negative semantics of the Greek adjective.

According to Taseva, who examines the function and distribution of various Slavonic prefixes and composita in Slavonic translations, the variety in Slavonic derivational means to translate Greek prefixes was probably due to the semantic asymmetry between Greek and Slavonic prefixes and prepositions and the particular translation principles employed by the individual translators (Taseva 2000: 192). The prefix ἰ enjoyed greater popularity than ἐζ in various Slavic translations when the translators had to render the Greek α-privatum.
In sum, the Slavonic lexical variation presented in example 4.2.1 demonstrates not just the richness of the derivational means of Church Slavonic but also the (mostly) good command of both Greek and Slavonic by the Slavic translators, who used various (synonymous) structural means in order to represent Greek negative semantics.

4.2.2.
S ο μόνος δοτήρ τῆς ζωῆς δώρησαι μοι μετάνοιαν ὁλόκληρον, 55v (lines 25-26)
P 5894 (10v) and EP καὶ δώρησαι μοι ὁ δοτήρ τῆς ζωῆς μετάνοιαν ὁλόκληρον “The sole giver/dispenser of life, give me a complete redemption!”
α Ελληνες Δατσάκμ ζηση, Δρογί μη ποκαλης εκειεια, 6v (lines 5-6)
β Ελληνες Πελατσάκμ ζηση, Δρογί μη ποκαλις εκειεια, 16g (lines 21-22)

The lexical variation in example 4.2.2 is again a matter of prefixal choice in the Slavonic translation. The Greek word in question, δοτήρ, has the meanings ‘giver’ and ‘dispenser’ in Classical and Hellenistic Greek (Liddell and Scott 1996: 446). Both meanings (or rather, the basic meaning ‘giver’ and its elaboration, ‘dispenser’) could be implied in example 4.2.2 because of the dependent NP ζηση (‘life’). The difference in these two readings will be in terms of a focus on the distributive nature of the giving act, i.e., ‘dispenser of life’ vs. the very general ‘giver of life.’

This variation is also attested in such other CS texts as the Slavonic translation of the Euchologion. There we find κρηπιντθην πελατσαλ for χορηγγος in the Euchologium Sinaiticum but κρηπιντθην Δατσαλ in a Trebnik of Bulgarian provenance from the 15th century. In the newest study on the Euchologion, done by Xristina Tončeva, this variation is presented as a matter of mere synonymy (Tončeva 2005: 92).
I was able to locate one instance of δοτηρο in the New Testament, in 2 Cor 9:7, where all codices of the Slavonic Apostle agree in their translation:

ιλαρον γαρ δοτηρο ἀγαπα το θεος
tης ει δατελα λειτυ ελ (Ch)
‘God loves a cheerful giver.’

Apparently, this example would not allow for the word πιοδατελα to be used here because this is not a distributive context. The distributive semantics of the word for ‘giver’ in Slavonic is realized through the prefix πιο, thus πιοδατελα. The lexical choice in the Slavonic translation of 2 Cor 9:7 is the general word for ‘giver,’ without the distributive prefix; this is perhaps determined by the lack of a dependent noun phrase or the lack of plural or collective beneficiaries. We could argue that in any context where there is such a NP, the semantics of the act of ‘giving’ could be further enunciated by the presence of the semantic component of ‘distribution.’ Therefore, in this case we would have an example of skewing between semantics and grammar.

In the case of the Thekara, it is unclear whether the Greek δοτηρο has the general meaning of ‘giver’ or whether this meaning is further enunciated as ‘dispenser.’ We already saw that both meanings are present in the semantics of the Greek word; additional syntactic and lexical material (the NP) would highlight one or the other meaning.

To sum up, the lexical variation Δατελα-πιοΔατελα in 4.2.2 is significant not merely on a referential level. It demonstrates the different derivational means employed
by version $\alpha$ and $\beta$ for an emphasis on the generality of the act of giving or the element of distribution in this act.

4.2.3.

$\sum$ κατάδυσον τα ἐμα πληγμέληματα, 65r (line 19)
“Make my sins/transgressions sink”

$\alpha$ παράγηκα μετὰ πρεπέσεωι, 14v (lines 15-16)
$\beta$ παράγηκα μετὰ σφρασεωι, 23r (lines 4-5)

The word πληγμέλημα (‘sin, offence,’ Lampe 1968: 1093) is a part of the common Christian vocabulary; however, it is found not in The New Testament but in the Psalter and in Patristic writings. The passage from the Thekara in 4.2.3, although resembling the Psalter in genre, does not in fact appear as a separate citation in the Psalms. In Psalm 69:5 (68:6) where the etymologically related word, πληγμέλεια (‘fault,’ ‘offence,’ ‘error’) occurs it is translated in OCS by πρεπέσεωι:

$\sum$ θεός σὺ ἐγνως τὴν ἀφροσύνην μου καὶ αἱ πληγμελείαι μου ἀπὸ σοῦ οὐκ ἐκρύβησαν ἐξε, τα σφραστὶς βεβλυκας μοι, ἵ πρεπέσεωι μοι οτὶ τοὺς οὐ φυταύρωσα σια (PS)
‘Lord, you know my foolishness, and my transgressions are not hidden from you.’

The word attested in Psalterium Sinaiticum is the one attested in version $\alpha$ of the Thekara. Naturally, this word has a large distribution in medieval texts (in copies of the Gospel and the Psalter, among others) and most often translates the Greek πληγμέλεια.

The word attested in version $\beta$ of the Thekara, σφρασεωι, seems to have the same semantics as ‘sins.’ However, in view of the the fact that in OCS σφρασεωι
translates nouns different from πλημμέλημα, such as ἀμάρτημα (‘sin’) πτώμα (‘fall’, metaph.), I would argue that σγρεψημάα conveys more the connotations of ‘faults’ than ‘sins’; cf. the following quote from the Gospels:

Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πάντα ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὰ ἀμαρτήματα καὶ αἱ βλασφημίαι ὅσα ἐὰν βλασφημήσωσιν (Mark 3:28)

ΑΜΗΝ ΓΑΛΙΚ ΕΛΛΗΝΕΣ ΤΟΙΣ ΒΛΕΠΩΝ ΣΤΘΙΟΝΤΑΣ ΕΑΥ ΚΩΝ ΒΛΕΠΑΙΣΚΟΜΕΝ. ΣΓΡΕΨΗΜΑΑ Η ΕΛΑΣΦΗΜΗΑ. ΕΛΙΚΟ ΑΜΗ ΕΛΑΣΦΗΜΗΚΑΙΣΤΩ (M)

‘Amen, I say to you that all will be forgiven the sons of men, sins and blasphemies, however much they blaspheme.’

In sum, despite the more subtle connotations of σγρεψημάα as ‘fault,’ both Slavonic versions of the Thekara render the core meaning of the Greek word πλημμελήματα, ‘transgressions’ or ‘sins,’ by the means of two different prefixes.

4.2.4.
S ὅν ὑμεῖ ἄδωξέ ξι τάς ὅ κτίσις, 66v (lines 16-17)
“All creatures sing and glorify him”
α ἐγὼ πεῖ ἔσται καὶ τραπ. 16r (lines 4-5)
β ἐγὼ παρατραπ. καὶ τραπ. 24r (line 7)

The lexical variation in 4.2.4 is between ‘sing’ and ‘glorify’; both Greek words describe the same basic phenomenon, ‘glorification of God.’ In biblical discourse, it is quite common to have two or three words to express the same meaning, in so-called hendiadys. The purpose of having hendiadys is to amplify the message of the clause or the sentence and also to enhance it for rhetorical purposes. In 4.2.4 we have the hendiadys ύμεῖ καὶ δοξάζει, ‘sing and glorify,’ which could be combined in one

---

40 Hendiadys is a grammatical structure in which two nouns linked by and have a subordinate relationship, rather than a coordinate relationship, usually found with and. In hendiadys, the two nouns represent a single modified concept, rather than two separate concepts found in coordinate structures.
expression, ‘sing glorious songs.’ Most often in biblical language, such hendiadys constructions are formulae, and they were memorized as such. They were a sort of mnemotechnical device for memorizing huge chunks of texts, which were then easy to be found as references.

This particular passage from Thekara, although not a direct citation from the Psalter, is an allusion to several Psalms, among which are 27:6 (26:6), 66:2 (65:2), 68:4 (67:5), 104:33 (103:33), 105:2 (104:2), and 117:1 (116:1). Psalm 117 is very short, only two verses, but it is the quintessence of the Psalter’s message, namely, that everyone (every nation) should praise and laud God. The message in the Thekara 4.2.5 is very similar in this respect and is clearly reminiscent of Psalm 117.

The variation between the Slavonic texts in 4.2.4 seems to be again solely on a derivational level, with version β providing additional linguistic material, the prefix κακ, to render the morphological structure of the Greek verb. However, my observations on the OCS translation of the Psalter and the syntactic relations between the verb ὄμνει and its indirect object, God, in the Thekara, lead me to another conclusion, based on the grammatical and semantic combinatorial properties of the Slavic verbs πέ and κακομεράκ in the OCS translation of certain Psalms in the Psalterium Sinaiticum as well as in verses from the Acts and the Epistles:

1. \[ \Psi\alpha\lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon \delta\eta \tau\omega \delta\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\iota \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\omicron, \delta\omicron\tau\epsilon \delta\omicron\zeta\chi\nu \alpha\omicron\nu\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\omicron, \] Psalm 66:2 (65:2), ποιήσε με ἐν εὐμετακάσθων εὐρυσκεῖν σάλαξ (‘Sing praises to his name, give glory to his praise’).
2. ἄσατε τῷ θεῷ, ψάλατε τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ, Psalm 68:4 (67:5), ΠΟΙΗΣ ἐν ἘΚΣΩΝΤΕ ἡμᾶς ἕν ἑνὶ (‘Sing to God, sing praises to his name’).

3. ἄσομαι καὶ ψαλῶ τῷ κυρίῳ, Psalm 27:6 (26:6), ΠΟΙΗΣ ἘΚΣΩΝΤΕ ἑνὶ (‘I will sing, I will even sing psalms unto the Lord’).

The examples show that, syntactically, both Greek verbs ἄσομαι (from ἄδω, ‘to sing’) and ψαλῶ (ψάλλω, ‘to sing to the music of the harp’) combine with a dative indirect object of the BENEFICIARY of the ‘singing’ or ‘praising.’ It is not clear whether these two verbs were distinguished in the Psalter as ‘to sing’ and ‘to praise’ or whether they were virtual synonyms denoting a specific mode of vocalization, singing. This appears also to be the case in the Slavonic translation of Eph 5:19, where we see a lexical variation among different Slavonic codices in rendering ἄδοντες καὶ ψάλλοντες with χαλεμε, ποσιμονισμε, εκπευρασμε and ηεποσομε, used almost indiscriminately, much like the Slavonic translation of ψάλατε with ποιες and ἘΚΣΩΝΤΕ in examples 1 and 2.

Consider the Slavonic translation of Eph 5:19:

4. λαλοῦντες ἐκατοίκ [ἐν] ψαλμοῖς καὶ ύμνοις καὶ ψιθαῖς πνευματικαῖς, ἄδοντες καὶ ψάλλοντες τῇ καρδίᾳ ύμῶν τῷ κυρίῳ, Eph 5:19
Γλαύκη σοι οὐκ ῥήσαντες ἡμῖν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν (Ch) vs. χαλεμε οὐ κατεψομε (Mat) vs. ποσιμονιζε οὐ εκπευρασε (Str) vs. εκπευρασε οὐ κατεψομε (14th-century codex of Bulgarian provenience, 14th-century codex of Serbian provenience)
‘addressing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody to the Lord with all your heart’
Examples 1, 2, and 3 point to a specific way of using ποικ vis-a-vis ἐκποιηθ in Slavonic: when they are together in a passage, they quite frequently appear in one and the same order, ποικ and ἐκποιηθ, and vary rarely ἐκποιηθ and ποικ. This might be again a manifestation of their formulaic status in the text of the Psalter. We cannot be certain that in Slavonic there was any difference between these two verbs on the level of semantics, but it looks like adding the prefix ἐκ to the verb stem was not just a derivational device for the purpose of forming aspectual pairs.

The third verb in Greek that denotes ‘singing’ in the NT is ὑμνέω: “1. to hymn, i.e., to sing a religious ode; by implication to celebrate (God) in song: – sing a hymn (praise unto)” (Strong). In Danker’s dictionary, ὑμνέω appears as both transitive, ‘sing in praise of’ (with accusative object) and intransitive, ‘sing (a hymn)’ (Danker et al., 2000: 1027). Consider the following examples:

5. Κατὰ δὲ τὸ μεσονύκτιον Παύλος καὶ Σιλᾶς προσευχόμενοι ὑμνοῦν τὸν θεόν, Acts 16:25
Πλαθομένη τῇ παρα καὶ ικανή τραγωδία μαθόν πιάστα ἔκα (Mat; similarly in Æ and Str) vs. πιάστα ἔκα (Ch)
‘But about midnight Paul and Silas were praying and singing hymns to God.’

6. ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας ὑμνήσω σε, Hb 2:12 (quoting Ps 22:22)
Πο σφέλῃ ἐνδέκει ἐκποιηθ τὰ (Ch; similarly in Æ, PS and NP)
‘In the midst of the congregation I will praise you.’

41 Note the opposite situation in the Slavonic translation of Eph 5:19 in the 14th-century Bulgarian and Serbian codices of the Apostle that are quoted in Xristova 2004: 294.
It is useful now to summarize the Slavonic translation of ὑμνέω in the NT examples. In 6, the Greek verb is translated with ποιεῖ in all codices; the verb takes an Accusative as a direct object and that is what we find in most of the Slavic codices as well. However, Ch deviates from this by rendering the Greek Accusative with a Dative, perhaps due to realization of God as a BENEFICIARY or ADDRESSEE of the singing, and not as a PATIENT of the praising. The latter semantic role of the direct object is perhaps what the Greek had intended by using ὑμνέω and Accusative – not just singing but praising God. This situation is reflected in example 6 in the Slavonic translation of Hb 2:12, ποιεῖ (Accusative direct object). In other words, in ποιεῖ, the focus is on the recipient (object/patient) of the praise, while in ποιεῖ, on the manner of speech, ‘singing.’

If we analyze the Thekara 4.2.4 in the light of the above interpretations, we can observe two important things. First, the syntactic relation in version α between the verb and its object is just like the one in example 5, imitating perhaps the Greek Accusative of the direct object of ὑμνεῖ. Version β, on the other hand, uses the prefixed verb ποιεῖ, which yields the correct syntactic and perhaps semantic relation, ‘All creatures lauds and praise him.’ In my opinion, the meaning ‘praise’ is more appropriate in this context than just ‘sing,’ but again, we cannot be sure exactly what the lexical choice in version α, ποιεῖ,
denotes – singing (as a manner of speech) or praising. One last detail in this interpretation is the presence of the verb ιστο in 4.2.4. The sequence ποιειται το φιλοχριστον then could yield a different interpretation of ποιειται as an intransitive verb. The Accusative object ἐρχεται, despite its proximity to ποιειται (which is a result of a faithful rendering of the Greek word order in 4.2.4), could be, in fact, the complement of ιστο. If we accept this interpretation, we must indeed recognize the semantic difference between ποιειται, ‘to sing’ (in version α) and καταπελειαεται, ‘praise’ (in version β) as a result of skewing between grammar and semantics.

4.3. Lexical doublets

4.3.1.
S ὁ κρατῶν ἀπάντων τοὺς ὀίκας καὶ ἅγιον ὡς βουλεῖ, 51v (lines 24-25)
‘The one who holds all the helms of government and leads/rules/governs [the way] he wants’

α Ημε άκριτος κεκραμμένη η θεά ιμέν ομομοιη, 3r (lines 9-10)
β η σκιπρίκις κεκραμμένη η πράκτορη ιμέν ομομοιη, 13r (line 26)

At first sight, this passage presents us with synonymous lexical doublets, but a closer look at the Slavonic translations will reveal that the two Slavonic lexemes are not exact synonyms. The passage in example 4.3.1 is an allusion to Psalm 8:6 (8:7):

Καὶ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἑργα τῶν χειρῶν σου, πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ
Ἡ ποταμαὶ η ἐν ψυχῇ ἄκριτος τρόποι, κακῶς ποικίλως ἐν πολλῇ ἑνῷ ἐγο (PS)
‘And you have set him over the works of your hands, you have put all things under his feet.’
The primary meaning of the verb in 4.3.1, ἀγω in the NT is ‘to bring, to take s.o. somewhere.’ There are few instances where the meaning of ‘to lead’ is intended instead. The etymologically related verb ὀδηγέω \(^4\) denotes the meaning ‘to guide,’ which is an semantic extention of ‘to lead.’ Alternatively, we could say that a noun complement, for example, ‘way,’ is already embedded in the semantics of ὀδηγέω, hence, ‘to lead the way.’

The verb in version α, ἐδυνηθη has the primary meaning of ‘to lead’ in CS:

1. τυφλοὶ εἶσιν ὀδηγοὶ τυφλῶν, τυφλὸς δὲ τυφλὸν ἐὰν ὀδηγῇ, ἀμφότεροι εἰς βόθυνον πεσοῦνται, Matthew 15:14
   ἐκεῖ ἔγινεν πάθος γεγονός. Ἐκεῖ ἔγινεν πάθος καὶ ἐκεῖ ἔγινεν πάθος. (M; similarly in Z and A)
   ‘they are blind guides, and if a blind man leads a blind man, both will fall into a pit.’

This meaning of the Slavonic verb ἐδυνηθη is also reflected in its nomina agentis:

2. ἐξ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται ἤγομένους, Matthew 2:6
   Ἕκε τῷ ὑπὲρ ἐδυνηθη ἔκεῖ ἔγινεν (A) vs. ἔδυνησε (M and SK)
   ‘for from you shall come a ruler’

3. Ἀπάσασθε πάντας τοὺς ὑγομένους ὑμῶν καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους, Hb 13:24

---

\(^4\) This verb is the e-grade form of ἀγω compounded with ἱοδ-.
Example 2 shows the expected meaning of the nomen agentis ῥγούμενος ‘leader,’ present also in the Slavonic words вождь and владыка. The lexical variation in example 3, however, points to somewhat different understanding of ῥγούμενος as seen in the Slavonic translations reflected in different manuscripts: ‘leader’ and ‘ruler.’ Both words are very close in their semantics, but their relation is not straightforward. Although, in most cases a leader is a ruler and vice versa, there are contexts where this is not the case.

The verb in version β, πραβήσθη, has similar semantics, but with a moral nuance of ‘to lead into the right direction,’ which is based on the root прав (right, correct).


Καὶ εἴσεχθη πάτερα σφυχὰ ἐλαὶ καὶ πραβήσθη πᾶτα τρεῖς (GP)

‘In all your ways acquaint yourself with her, that she may rightly direct your paths’

5. τὰς δὲ διοξολογίας τοῦ Ιησοῦ μὴ γράφεσθαι δι’ ὅτι εἰς ὠρανὸν ὀδηγοῦμεθα

αἱ σαλβήσεις βοῶμα ἐν πέθαν, ἐνα λυκεῖ ἐναν πραβησθε ἐκεῖ (Supr 403:25)

‘not to write God’s praises, but [to be] led in the right direction by them [the praises] in Heaven’

43 The Slavonic sources here are given according to Xristova 2004: 395.

44 Cf. Cejtlin’s observation on the root прав and the verb πραβήσθη in OCS: “πραβήσθη is used in OCS with the meaning ‘to guide somebody,’ ‘to make/create in a good manner,’ and ‘to rule justly.’” (1986: 105).
In sum, the examples provided from CS texts show that the verb ἐδόθη in CS was the normal rendition of Greek ἀγαπεῖν ('to guide'), while πρεβεννεῖσθαι translated ὑποτελόμενον and, only rarely, ὀδηγεῖν. Given the distribution of Greek-Slavonic translation pairs, it is not justified semantically or etymologically to perceive πρεβεννεῖσθαι and ἐδόθη as exact synonyms. Moreover, the expression, божи дух правыи и владыи ('the Divine Spirit leading and ruling'), attested in John the Exarch (Sreznevskij 1971: I, 72) as an example of hendiadys, testifies to the closely related meaning of ἐδόθη and πρεβεννεῖσθαι, but not to their fully synonymous nature.

In example 4.3.1 of the Thekara, both verbs πρεβεννεῖσθαι and ἐδόθη have an optional NP complement, which is left implied. However, because the verbs are without a salient complement, it is difficult to judge the axiological nuances in their semantics. It could very well be that they were full synonyms in this context; alternatively, the translator of version α may have focused on the more general ‘leading’ (ἐδόθη), while the translator of β emphasized the ethical (morally evaluative) ‘leading into the right direction’ (πρεβεννεῖσθαι).

4.3.2.
S Ἑλεστόν με τὸν ἀπολαύσαντα τῆς χάριτος σου πολλάκις, καὶ ύπερμέτρον ὄδεψε ἀνετήσαντα, 54r (lines 8-10)
‘Have mercy on me, the one who enjoyed your grace many times, and the one denying himself beyond all measure without [any] apprehension’
α ποιλόν με, ἀναλαδιώσαντο σε καλὴ τροφὴ μνηματί, καὶ πλεῖς μερῶς ἐκ στρατῆς ὑπερασπίζοντο σε, 5r (lines 2-4)
β ποιλόν με, ἀναλαδιώσαντο καλὴ τροφὴ μνηματί, καὶ πλεῖς μερῶς ἐκ θησαυρῶν ὑφίσταντο, 15r (lines 5-7)
The adverb ἄδειως in example 4.3.2 is translated by two nearly synonymous variants, which are both attested in OCS texts. The concept of ‘fear’ is one that appears extremely often (approximately 200 times) in the Old Testament, especially in the Psalter. “The fear of the Lord is a permanent element in man’s relation to God, and is the divine effect on man’s anxiety, his uneasy conscience and divided loyalties...It is perhaps better to use the word ‘awe’ or ‘dread’ rather than ‘fear’ to describe this experience” (Richardson 1962: 81).

One very common approach to Slavic lexical pairs that denote one and the same Greek concept can be seen in Iskra Xristova’s analysis of the Slavic translation of the Aprakos. Lexical variation similar to 4.3.2, but this time between the nouns denoting ‘fear,’ appears in 1 Peter 3:15 and 1 John 4:18: ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν. Xristova, who mentions this variation, states only that, in the Athonite redaction of the Apostle, the word ἐφοβηθήσαν was replaced with στραχν (Xristova 2004: 409). The question why this was done was left without an answer or explanation – a very common (“hit list”) approach to Slavonic lexis.

I would like to adopt a different strategy in my analysis of the Slavonic lexical pair ἐφοβηθήσαν-στραχν, based partially on Nida’s analysis of the lexical semantics of the Greek New Testament and the cognitive model of the semantics of emotions. In order to determine fully the denotations and connotations of both words, we must view them, as well as related lexemes, in context:

1. καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν (Luke 2:9)  
   καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν στραχν, ἐγείρθαι (M; similarly in Z and A)  
   ‘and they were filled with fear’
2. Ἐχεὶ ἐδειλίσαν φόβῳ οὐ οὐκ ἦν φόβος, Psalm 14:5 (13:5) 
τὸν ἐκτραίωσιμον σιὰ ἐκεῖνοι οὐκ ἦν οὐκ ἐκ τραίωσιν (PS) 
‘There were they alarmed with fear, where there was no fear’

3. Οὐ φοβηθῇ απὸ φόβου νυκτερινοῦ, Psalm 91:5 (90:5) 
οὐ φοβοῦνται ὡς ἐν τῷ στραχῷ νυκτερινῷ (PS; similarly in NP). 
“You shall not be afraid of the terror by night’

4. Δουλεύσατε τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν φόβῳ, Psalm 2:11 
Παρατείνετε γενόμενι κύριον σὺ στραχῶν (PS, cf. Supr 285:14) 
“Serve the Lord with fear’

5. καὶ δειλία παντοῦ ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ’ ἐμέ. Φόβος καὶ τρόμος ἠλθεν ἐπ’ ἐμέ καὶ ἐκάλυψε με σκότος, Psalm 55:4-5 (54:5-6) 
στραχὸς συμβαίνεις ἄπαυσε ἡ μια. Ἐκκαλίζῃ ἐπὶ πρ𝛼ὸς ἡ μια ἡ ποιησα ἡ μια τῦμα (PS, στραχὸς συμβαίνῃ, NP) 
‘The fear of death came upon me. Fear and trembling came upon me, and darkness covered me’

6. ἐκ στραχὸς ἐκ τοιῶν ... στῶν σὺ θεοφανῆς καὶ σὺ στραχῶν, ‘In the holy church... stand with fear and fear’ (Jacob’s Homily for the Holy Sunday, in a 14th-century Miscellany; Avanesov, ed. 1988-: I, 300)

7. ἰσώζοις καὶ θανάτου θεοφανῆς θαλάκιον - ‘Jacob feared with a great fear’ (Paleia, 1406; Avanesov, ed. 1988-: I, 300)

The contextual meanings of the Slavonic nouns and verbs for ‘fear’ along with their collocations reveal a noticeable trend. The verb (αγ)στραχνῆσθ (αγ) could be both transitive (‘to frighten’) and reflexive (‘to fear’) but ἔοιμαι αγ ‘to be afraid of’ is always reflexive. The two reflexive verbs could be in parallel distribution (with no obvious difference in meaning). The numbers of attestations of the two verbs in OCS texts are in
favor of (ψ)βικτή σα, while στραβητή (σα) is attested only a few times in Supr with reflexive semantics (e.g., σύξε δε στραβή σα πνεγθελαγό, 490:9) and as a transitive (causative) participle in the Euchologium Sinaiticum (σολτε σα...κεσε σεστραβητεν γλεγεισκε, στραβητινης κε, Cejtlin et al., eds. 1994: 629).

However, this is not the case with the nouns θοληνι and στραχα. The collocations of στραχα do not map onto those of θοληνι. In addition, in order to bring more lexical and stylistical variety to the translation, the early Slavic translators apparently experimented with using different lexical items for the different parts of speech; cf. example 2 above.

Examples 5 and 6 are excellent examples of the nature of the semantic difference between θοληνι and στραχα, which lies in the conceptual grading of the intensity of ‘fear’ and the underlined cause of this emotion; cf. the following examples of intensive fear:

στραχα κελέμεν - ‘with great fear’
στραχα ηοστηναγε - ‘of the terror which comes by night’
στραχα ιαμητηνων - ‘the fear of death’

The word θοληνι does not replace στραχα in these collocations (except occasionally in the first one). The word στραχα and its modifiers in these examples reveal a semantics of intensive fear that is not present in the semantics of θοληνι. In other words, in CS, just like in any natural language, there are concepts of degrees of ‘fear’ that are lexicalized as separate words. Carl Buck provides such examples from different Indo-European
languages: ἐνοχ, φόβος, and τρόμος in Classical Greek; timor, metus, pavor, and terror in Latin; and στραχά and κωάζη in OCS (Buck 1949: 1153). He also observes that “in some cases there has been a shift from the objective ‘danger’ to the subjective ‘fear,’” as, conversely, words for ‘fear’ are often used objectively for what inspires fear, ‘a horror, a terror, danger” (ibid.). A similar approach to emotions and to fear, in particular, is found in the framework of cognitive linguistics but more elaborated in the form of a narrative scheme. The proponents of this framework analyze categories of negative emotions like ANGER and FEAR as “scenarios involving the stages of cause, actual emotion, control, loss of control and resulting action” (Ungerer and Schmid 1993: 141).45

In terms of these cognitive observations, it seems very likely that CS στραχά was used mostly to express a stronger type of fear, ‘dread,’ while κωάζη was reserved for a milder form of fear. In the case of the semantics of στραχά, there is also attention to the cause or agent of that emotion, revealed in different collocations (νομίτηματος and συμπήρητη).

If we go back to the Thekara’s translation, we will see that nothing in the immediate contexts can explain the lexical variation κωάζη-στραχά. It might be that this variation was prompted by the realization of the objective vs. subjective concept of ‘fear’; alternatively, the translators’ choice may have been a matter of personal preference. We

45 The narrative scheme of ‘fear,’ as presented in Ungerer and Schmid, contains five stages: 1) cause (dangerous situation: self is aware of the danger); 2) emotion (fear exists: psychological and behavioral effects); 3) attempt at control; 4) loss of control (the intensity of fear goes beyond the limit); 5) action (self flees from danger).
should also keep in mind that one of the manifestations of ‘fear’ is ‘apprehension,’ which is closer to mental states than to emotions, e.g., ‘I am afraid that he will not come back.’ It might very well be that in example 4.3.2 of the *Thekara*, we witness this ‘mental’ and not merely emotional fear.

Despite the fact that my interpretation of the lexical semantics of ἀφαφή and εὐθαλά does not fully answer the question about what motivated this particular lexical variation in the Slavonic translation of the *Thekara*, it provides a key to a better understanding of the primary and contextual meanings of the words in medieval lexica, so that we can try to interpret (and not just state) various translation choices. My interpretation of the emotional category of ‘fear’ also shows that various lexical choices to designate ‘fear’ stem out of the diverse continuum of items in the conceptualization of one of the most subjective categories, emotions.

4.3.3.

4.3.3.1.

S Καὶ δώρησαί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ πένθος πενθήσαι ἐμαυτὸν, ἵνα μὴ κλαύσω εἰς αἰῶνας αἰῶνον ἄνόνγιτα, 52r (lines 2-5)

“And give me, the sinner, a cry to cry for myself (to pity myself), in order not to cry forever and ever in vain”

α Η δοφή μη γρεγενής πᾶ πλακάκες σε, δαναούς σε εκ τεκώ θυγατρέχει, 3r (lines 14-15)

β Η δοφή μη γρεγενής πλακάκες σε, δαναούς σε δια μεν εφίλως έκ τεκώ ἔπολαζη, 13v (lines 3-5)

The lexical variation in example 4.3.3 presents two different semantic components, which, despite their similarities on the denotational level, do convey fine connotative differences - ἔτι θυγατρέχει (without advantage/success) vs. ἕπολαζη (without
benefit or use). There is definitely a semantic link between these two concepts; however, ‘success’ and ‘benefit’ can be distinguished as agent-oriented (‘having success’) and experiencer-oriented (‘receiving benefit’), respectfully. Not always does success include benefits, and not all benefits are due to success. In order to determine the nature of this lexical variation in the *Thekara*, I will look first at the attested uses of ἰνάσιτα and πολυζα in OCS and later texts, and then analyze the translators’ choices.

The Greek adverb ἀνάνητα has the meanings ‘unprofitable’ or ‘in vain’ (with the latter meaning only in Euripides; Liddell and Scott 1996: 147). A related adjective with the ending –τως is attested in Palladius’ “Anthologia Graeca” (6th century B.C.; ibid.). In earlier Slavonic translations ἀνάνητα is rendered as θεί θείσια in *Supr* 50:12 (Cejtlin et al., eds. 1994: 745) but as неполезный in Codex Cluzianus (ibid.: 370).

A more frequent word for expressing the same meaning is the verb ὑφελέω (‘to help,’ ‘to assist,’ ‘to be of use or service’; Liddell and Scott 1996: 2042). The usual Slavonic equivalent of this verb is the noun πολυζα in existential constructions: η πολυζα μην ο ε ν κατα and η κακε να πολυζαν in different codices of the Slavonic Apostle: 2 Cor. 12:1 - η πολυζα μην ε ν κατα (Mat) and η πολυζα κακε μη (Str); 1 Cor. 10:23 - η κακε να πολυζαν (Mat and Str). Some of the examples from the OCS Gospels show complete agreement between Z, M, and A in their translation of ὑφελέω in different contexts: ὑσπειθ (Matthew 27:24), πολυζα κατα (Matthew 16:26, Mark 8:36, John 6:63, 12:19), κακε πολυζα νκεν (Luke 9:25), πολυζαντιν ηα (Matthew 15:5, Mark 7:11), πολυζα οβερετι (Mark 5:26).
Two examples of the semantic and syntactic properties of ὠφελέω and πολέμα in OCS and later texts reveal the differences in their meaning:

1. ἡ σάρξ οὐκ ὁφελεῖ οὐδέν (John 6:63) 
   οτῶο απεστά ἡπολέμα ἀκακοθε (M; similarly in Z and A) 
   ‘Flesh is of no avail’

2. ἐν οἷς ὀφελήθησαν οἱ περιπατοῦντες (Hebrews 13:9) 
   οτῷ ἡνε ᾑ πηνᾶσα πολέμα χαζείμ (S) 
   οτῷ ἡνε χαζείμ οἱ ᾑ αὐσύμβικος εἰς (Mat) 
   ‘…which have not benefited their adherents.’

The translation reflected in the Mat does not render faithfully the Greek text: it misrepresents the present participle περιπατοῦντες with a finite form just like ὀφελήθησαν and thus, in an attempt to make sense out of the passage, renders the verb with the reflexive (semantically, middle) agentive form ᾑ αὐσύμβικος εἰς (‘did not succeed’) instead of the experiencer-oriented ᾑ πηνᾶσα πολέμα (‘did not receive benefit’).

Examples that translate ὁφελέω are abundant not only in the CS texts but also in the Thekara; for example,

4.3.3.2. 
S ὅπου οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνάκλησις ὅπου οὐκ ἔστι μετάνοια ὅπου οὐκ ὁφελήσοι δάκρυα, 
61v (lines 25-26) 
“where there is no invocation, nor redemption, [and] neither will tears be useful/helpful”
α ἡκε ὑπε πουλη ε ὑπ βεζεμε, ἡκε ὑπ άκπεθε καλθ, 11v (lines 16-17) 
β ἡκε η ὑπ βουλη, ἑ βεζεμε. ἡκε ιππηλζες ενι καλθ, 20v (lines 10-11)
This example reveals an additional component in our analysis of the lexical variation. It appears that the translator(s) of \( \beta \) consistently chose one and the same lexeme in different grammatical forms despite the presence of two different Greek words, \( \dot{\alpha}v\nu\nu\eta\tau\alpha \) and \( \dot{\omega}f\epsilon\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\omega \). It is interesting to note that the variation \( \sigma\gamma\imath\iota\pi\epsilon\chi\lambda \) - \( \pi\omicron\alpha\nu\zeta\alpha \) is present in another text, the *Lestvica* (John Climacus’ *Ladder*), where the distribution of the variants is as follows: \( \pi\omicron\alpha\nu\zeta\alpha \rho\alpha\lambda \) in the 14th-century Trnovo copy vs. \( \eta \alpha \sigma\gamma\imath\iota\pi\epsilon\chi\lambda \) in the Preslav copy (Mostrova 1994: 417).

The distribution of the lexical doublets \( \sigma\gamma\imath\iota\pi\epsilon\chi\lambda \) – \( \pi\omicron\alpha\nu\zeta\alpha \) in CS, along with the semantic analysis of ‘success’ and ‘benefit,’ allows me to interpret the lexical variation in the *Thekara* as due to the perception that the words \( \sigma\gamma\imath\iota\pi\epsilon\chi\lambda \) and \( \pi\omicron\alpha\nu\zeta\alpha \) were semantically linked but not synonymous. These words, unlike the lexical doublets in the Ohrid and Preslav redactions such as \( \nu\kappa\epsilon\sigma\omega\nu\kappa\epsilon\sigma\kappa \) – \( \delta\lambda\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\kappa\epsilon\sigma\kappa \), do differ in their connotations.

The Slavic translators of a later epoch (14\textsuperscript{th} century), being aware of these connotations, were free to choose either lexeme depending on their own translation approach. Therefore, it is unjustified to look at \( \sigma\gamma\imath\iota\pi\epsilon\chi\lambda \) and \( \pi\omicron\alpha\nu\zeta\alpha \) as only a pair of Preslav-Trnovo lexical doublets and to determine the origin of a text based on the use of either word in isolation.

4.3.4.1.
\( \beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\omega \; \tau\eta\nu \; \dot{\omicron}x\nu\nu\rho\iota\iota\alpha\nu \; \mu\alpha \; \dot{\beta}x\sigma\alpha\nu\dot{\iota}\iota\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \; \mu\alpha \) \( \dot{\eta} \; \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota \alpha \), 56r (lines 11-12)

“I see my laziness and my heart suffers”

\( \alpha \; \kappa\iota\zeta\alpha\lambda \; \lambda\epsilon\nu\mu\iota\; \lambda\omicron\upsilon \; \nu\; \sigma\tau\rho\alpha\dot{\alpha}\epsilon\tau\nu \; \dot{\lambda} \; \dot{\alpha} \omicron \; \lambda\iota\omicron\upsilon \; \dot{\lambda} \; \dot{\alpha} \omicron \), 6v (lines 14-15)

\( \beta \; \kappa\iota\zeta\alpha\lambda \; \lambda\epsilon\nu\mu\iota\; \mu\alpha \omicron \; \dot{\lambda} \; \dot{\alpha} \omicron \; \lambda\iota\omicron\upsilon \; \dot{\lambda} \; \dot{\alpha} \omicron \), 16v (line 5)
Example 4.3.4.1 displays the interplay between semantics and grammar expressed in the case of a particular verbal pair, \( \text{μοφυνθις} \ (\text{‘to be tormented’}) \) and \( \text{στραλααθ} \ (\text{‘suffer’}). \) Translation \( b \) renders the Greek \( \text{βασανιζεται} \) with the reflexive \( \text{μοφυνθις} \), while translation \( a \) uses \( \text{στραλααθ} \) to denote a similar meaning.

My own explanation for this lexical variation in the Thekara (and in other CS texts) is based on my analysis of the structural means employed by early Slavic translators to represent active and middle verbal semantics. While both verbs are transitive, the meaning of \( \text{στραλααθ} \) is the quasi-middle ‘to suffer,’ while the meaning of \( \text{μοφυνθις} \) is active ‘to torture.’ By making \( \text{μοφυνθις} \) reflexive, \( \text{μοφυνθις} \) in OCS, the meaning ‘to suffer’ becomes the common denominator for both verbs, with a focus on the cause of the suffering – the ‘torment’ – in the case of \( \text{μοφυνθις} \).

In the NT, the verb \( \text{βασανιζεται} \) is used only in 2 Pt 2:8, where it is “connected to the suffering of the righteous” (Kittel 1976: 573). The agentive noun \( \text{βασανιστης} \) occurs once in Matthew 18:34 in the sense of ‘tormentor.’

The Slavonic translation of 2 Pt 2:8 will show how the Slavs perceived the diathesis of the Greek \( \text{βασανιζεται} \):

```
Βλέμματι γάρ καί ἄκοι ὁ δίκαιος ἐγκατοικών ἐν αὐτοῖς ἤμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας ψυχὴν δικαιαν ἀνόμους ἔργοις ἐβασανίζεν, 2 Pt 2:8
Ειδανενεν ενη σαρκάσιαν παρελθάναι, καθαρίν ἐνη νησιν, ἀλή ὦτ αὐτή ἀλή παρελθάνει ευδικονήτως ἄρα λαβά τον μαφυθίς (Ch)
'For by what that righteous man saw and heard as he lived among them, he was vexed in his righteous soul day after day with their lawless deeds.'
```
The verb used in the Slavonic translation in 2 Pt 2:8 is МОЖУЩ, used in a middle sense with the meaning ‘to torment one’s soul.’ Due to the nature of the middle sense, the expression ДИЯД МОЖУЩ refers both to the ‘suffering’ and to ‘torture.’

However, we find lexical variation in the OCS Gospels that reflects the meaning of ‘suffer’ in two different lexemes:

ó παῖς μου βέβληται ἐν τῇ σκίᾳ παραλυτικός, δεινός βασανιζόμενος, Matthew 8:6 ἄτροχος μον ἐκεῖθεν ἐκ τοῦ ἀλαζόνου. Αὐτὸς ἐκεῖ ἵπποι στραγαλᾶ (M; similarly in Z and A) vs. ΜΕΛΑΝΑ (SK)
‘My servant is lying paralyzed at home, in terrible distress’

This example shows the grammaticalization of the agentive semantics of the στραγαλᾶ, expressed through the active form of the participle, and the middle semantics of ΜΕΛΑΝΑ, expressed through the reflexive Α. Thus, the Slavonic verbs МОЖУЩА and ΣΤΡΛΑATH both denote ‘suffering,’ but through different grammatical means.

What is the situation with the derverbal nouns ΣΤΡΑΛΑΝΗ and ΜΟΥΥΛΗ? Consider the following example from the Thekara:

4.3.4.2.
56v (lines 4-5)
‘Here enjoyment, there suffering’
7r (line 7)
16v (line 19)
This example is part of a long paragraph, where the author compares the earthly life (‘here’) and the life in Hell (‘there’). Similar lexical variation is attested in other OCS texts such as the Euchologium Sinaiticum, Supr, etc. (Cejtlin et al., eds. 1994: 626).

The pair στραναθνη - ἀγγελενη is also discussed by Xristova (2004: 525); she contrasts them as features of the Athonite and Ohrid redactions of the Slavonic Apostle, respectively. These lexical doublets were closely related in Christian ethics, and the Slavic translators were undoubtedly aware of that.

The related noun βασανισμός in the NT is limited only to two passages in Revelation 9:5 and 18:7. In the first, the word is used “actively, of the torment which will come on men as the first woe” (Kittel 1976: 563). In the second, it is used “passively and denotes the suffering of Babylon when deprived of its power.” (ibid.: 563):

αλλὰ ἵνα βασανισθήσονται μὴνας πέντε καὶ ὁ βασανισμὸς αὐτῶν ὡς βασανισμὸς σκορπίου, Revelation 9:5
Νοὶ δὲ Ἦς ὅνῃ τὴ ἀγγελενὴ ἡ αγγελενὴ ἢ, ἵνα μὴ ἀγγελενὴ σκορπίου (Gennadius Bible, 1499)
‘They were allowed to torture them for five months, and their torture was like the torture of a scorpion.’

Δότε αὕτη βασανισμὸν καὶ πένθος, Revelation 18:7
ἀδαματὴ ἐν Ἦς ὅνῃ ᾿αγγελενὴ (Gennadius Bible, 1499)
‘give her torment and mourning.’

If we look at both the Greek and the Slavonic translation of the Revelation, we will notice that Kittel’s observations are quite reversed. In Revelation 9:5, the passive construction Ἦς ὅνῃ τὴ ἀγγελενὴ (‘receive suffering or torture’) is elaborated further: this is a suffering that is like the suffering caused by the scorpion. The predicate Ἦς ὅνῃ sets the
interpretation of ‘suffering’ for the rest of the passage; namely, it is a suffering that the subject will undergo (experiencer-oriented).

In the second example, from Revelation 18:7, in which Kittel sees a passive semantics in βασάνισμόν, it is a matter of perspective whether the suffering is passive or active. If we adopt the perspective of the agent, then, he will be the one causing the suffering (λαξάνεται ἐν ἀθόρ), and the semantics of βασάνισμόν will be active, i.e., ‘torture her.’ If, however, we decide to not take into account the agent causing the suffering, then the meaning of ‘suffering’ will be passive, oriented towards the experience of this suffering. The Slavonic language also reflects this dual semantics by lexicalizing it as two items, страданий ('suffering') and мъчений ('torment').

In summing up my observations on the lexical variations страданий – мъчений and страданий - мъчений, I would like to add that it is difficult to analyze only the two deverbal nouns without attending to their associated verbs, because it is the latter that give us a clue about the nature of the lexical variation. The nouns, due to their incapability to formally (structurally) express active and middle semantics, do not constitute a lexical pair (doubllets) because they reflect different semantic roles: agent (‘torturer’) and experiencer (‘sufferer’). Therefore, I would suggest that both pairs, nouns and verbs, be included on the traditional Ohrid-Preslav or Ohrid-Athonite lists of lexical doublets, but not just as a dialect difference, since the active and middle semantics of the verbal pair is crucial for understanding the dynamics of the lexical variation.
4.3.5.
S διὸ καὶ ἀνθις θαρσών εἰς τὸ ἔλεος τῆς εὐσπλαγχνίας σου, 58v (lines 14-16)
“Therefore, again I hope for/rely on your compassionate mercy”
α Τῇ καὶ η ἐπὶ ἡλιθίας σαμαριτῶν τῇ διάθεσε, 9r (lines 1-2)
β Τῇ καὶ η ἐπὶ ὁ ἡλιθίας σαμαριτῶν τῇ διάθεσε, 18r (lines 23-24)

The lexical variation in example 4.3.5 is between two semantically related words, ἀρσέω (‘to take heart,’ ‘to make bold’) and θαρσέω (‘to hope,’ ‘to have confidence’). Although they are part of the same lexical field of ‘dare,’ we will see that they exhibit particular nuances of meaning due to the broad conceptual basis of the lexical field of ‘dare.’

The Greek word θαρσέω ‘to have courage,’ ‘to have confidence in,’ ‘to trust,’ ‘to make bold’ (Lampe 1978: 613) appears seven times in the NT, of which six times are in the Gospels. The semantics of the verbs for ‘dare’ is said to be “based on such varied notions as ‘endure,’ ‘undertake,’ ‘be firm,’ ‘be strong,’ ‘be eager,’ ‘have spirit,’ ‘believe (have confidence), ‘have need’” (Buck 1949: 1149).

In OCS Gospel codices, the Greek θαρσέω is translated with ἀρσέω, which is the imperfective form of the verb. Present in version β of the Thekara, the perfective form also appears in Suprasliensis 530:1: ἠναβλῆσα καὶ τὸ τέμπε οὐκ ἔχει θαρσέω καὶ ἔρχεται (μετέχει ἀναβλῆσαι θαρσέων) ἱνα ἦθε ‘He was beating his breast, not having the courage to look at the sky.’ In this context, the verb in version α of the Thekara, θαρσέω, would have been impossible. By contrast, consider the following passage from Matthew 9:2 in M, also present in Z and A: ἤ θαρσέω καὶ τὸ τέμπε οὐκ ἔχει θαρσέων: ἀρσέω.
The two verbs appear in free (parallel) variation in Matthew 9:22 and Matthew 14:27, both times translating θάρσεω:


The verb ἀρξηκτη usually occurs with an infinitive, denoting ‘to dare to do something’ or independently, ‘to have courage.’ Very rarely is it attested with the meaning ‘to rely on’; one example, which is not very clear, is found in the 14th-century Slavonic (Russian redaction) translation of the Spiritual Instructions of Theodore the Stoudite: κυ εκδηλεσ πρωρετηνού ερημιν ἀρξηκτη μπορουν μπορεμεν πιστη, “Looking toward [his] future gain, he dares the greater path” (Avanesov, ed. 1988-: III, 143).

The verb ἑλπιζω ακ takes the usual translation of two other Greek verbs, ἔλπιζω and πείθουμεν that are common in the Psalter’s vocabulary. In the CS tradition, ἑλπιζω ακ takes an object when it means ‘to rely on s.o. or something’; this is expressed through the preposition ἡκ + accusative or the dative without preposition. The former with the
meaning ‘to rely on,’ is the one found in version $\alpha$ of the *Thekara*. A different syntactic pattern, which expresses a different meaning, is $\text{ναλβειθ }\text{ζα}$ with the infinitive – for example, $\text{ναλβειθ }\text{ζα }\text{ζημεμμενε }\text{ετεφο }\text{βηετυθ}$. “And he was hoping to see some sign” (Luke 23:8, $M$; similarly in $Z$ and $A$); or, less commonly, with $\text{ιακε }+ \text{finite verb}$, e.g., $\text{ναλβειθ }\text{εο }\text{ιακε }\text{ποςονιμεισιν }\text{μοεθ}$, ‘I hope that you will listen to me’ (“Homily on the Assumption of the Virgin Mary” in the Čudov Sbornik, 14th c., quoted in Avanesov, ed. 1988-: V, 142).

The lexical choice in version $\beta$, $\text{θαρσεω}$, despite being closer to the meaning of the Greek $\text{θαρσεω}$, exhibits a somewhat odd syntactic behavior in this context. Our observations on OCS and later texts also showed that $\text{θαρσεω}$ traditionally translates $\text{θαρσεω}$; thus, we might suppose that version $\beta$ just followed the tradition mechanically. Version $\alpha$ is closer to the Greek text in its syntactic rendition of $\text{θαρσεω}$, but it is unclear whether the meaning ‘rely on,’ expressed by $\text{ναλβειθ }\text{ζε }\text{ζα}$, faithfully reflects the intention in the original Greek.

Although $\text{ναλβειθ }\text{ζε }\text{ζα}$ and $\text{θαρσεω}$ are close in meaning, they are not complete synonyms, which may be expected, given the different ways to conceptualize ‘dare’ in Indo-European languages. It seems as if the focus in the translation of version $\beta$, $\text{θαρσεω}$,
is more on the ‘courage’46 or the ‘boldness’ aspects of the concept of ‘dare,’ while the translation in version α emphasizes the aspect of ‘confidence.’

4.3.6.  
S πῶς ἄνελεήμονες καὶ ἀπαράκλητοι καὶ ἄσπλαγχνοι οἱ ῥομφέωντες ἄγγελοι, 63r (lines 1-2)  
‘And how merciless, non-compassionate and heartless your sword-carrying angels are’  

α  κακοὶ ἁμαλακτεῖνην καὶ ἀκριμάτειαν καὶ ἁμάλαθρας ῥηξινίς αὐτάν, 12v (lines 13-14)  
β  κακοὶ ἁμαλακτεῖνην καὶ ἀκριμάτειαν καὶ ἁμάλαθρας μικρὰς μχίμης αὐτάν, 21r (lines 23-24)  

The variation in example 4.3.6 is quite straightforward. The words ῥηξινίς and μικράς μχίμης are in a relation of meronomy (part-whole); version α has chosen the general term ῥηξινίς (‘those who carry weapons’) to render the Greek ῥομφέωντες, while version β has focused on a particular weapon - μικράς (‘sword’).47 The second choice is, in fact, a structural calque of the Greek word. Both variants, however, are appropriate in this context and manage to convey the image of the avenging angels. This image could be found in different books of the Old Testament and also in iconographical depictions, for example:

Καὶ ἔταξε τὰ χεροβίμη, καὶ τὴν φλογίνην ῥομφάιαν, Gen 3:24  
η ἡπτανή χεροβίμη καὶ πτανή οὐράλα (GP)  
‘and stationed the cherubims and the fiery sword’

---

46 Note that the deverbal noun ἀρκετήρικης denotes an exclusively monastic concept, ἀρκετήρικης μον οἰκε καὶ ἑαυτῷ (“my boldness before God”), as expressed in the Life of Feodosij Pečerskij (Avanesov, ed. 1988–: III, 144).

47 This kind of meronymic relation is a common point of semantic distinction in some Oxrid-Preslav lexical pairs, cf. δοκιμᾶς (‘clothing’) – ρηξά (‘shirt’).
The distinction between έκζηξης (‘sigh’) and στέναξης (‘groan’), which the two Slavic versions make in example 4.3.7, is also present in the semantics of the Greek word. In his section on Indo-European synonymy in the sphere of emotions, Carl Buck points out that, in most Indo-European languages, “some of the words for ‘groan’ cover also the milder ‘sigh’” (1949: 1131). In such cases the similarity of the emotion has overcome the difference in its expression, with a resulting extension of ‘groan’ to ‘sigh’ or vice versa.

How does this relate to the variation in the Thekara? The Greek word στενάγμος has the meanings ‘sighing’ and ‘groaning’ both in Classical and in Byzantine Greek (Liddell and Scott 1996: 1638; Lampe 1968: 1256). However, we will see that, in Slavonic, this semantic distinction is lexicalized in two different words: έκζηξης and στέναξης.

The word in version α, έκζηξης, suggests a more instantaneous (‘one-time’) expression of pain and sorrow generally with lower intensity, such as the uttering of a sigh. Consider the following example of έκζηξης:

πενθούσα και ζημομάτω, και έντεκκα, στενάξης (στενάγμος) υπήρχαν στάσες (14th-century copy of the Spiritual Instructions of Theodore Studite, quoted in Avanesov, ed. 1988-: II, 48) ‘I grieve and I am weak, and I comfort suffering with sighing.’
The word in version β, στενάχμος\(^{48}\) expresses the pain by referring to the stronger in intensity and longer in duration ‘groan’; cf. the following examples from *Supr*:

\[
\text{ὁ ἄνθυπατος ἐδάκρυσε μετὰ στεναχμοῦ μεγάλου}
\]
\[
\text{ἀνηφυτή προπλάκας σα κα στενάχμοις θεογονία (Supr 102:6)}
\]
\[
\text{‘Anthupatos cried out with a strong/loud groan.’}
\]

\[
\text{ἐξομολογούμενος τῷ θεῷ ἐν στεναχμοῖς}
\]
\[
\text{Ἠποτελοῦμενες καὶ ἐνδυμασίᾳ στεναχμηνία (Supr 168:10)}
\]
\[
\text{‘[he] was making a confession to God, with groaning.’}
\]

The examples given above show that, even in the early period of CS, ἐξομολογούμενος and στενάχμος translated one Greek word, στενάχμος, thus lexicalizing the high and the low intensity of emotional expression. The context in *Supr* 102:6 shows particularly the relationship of intensity between the modifying adjective θεογονία (‘great’) and the modified noun στενάχμη. I would suggest that the case of the lexical variation in example 4.3.7 of the *Thekara* is similar in nature, namely, a result of focusing on the intensity of the emotional expression. The degree of intensity is also one of the common points of contrast between words referring to evaluative expression of emotions. As such, it does not refer to lexical meaning but rather indexes conceptualization of emotions. Such indexical words have to be studied with reference to particular communicative situations, because the immediate context does not give enough information about the intensity of the emotions.

\[^{48}\text{The root of στενάχμος and στενάχμη is the Indo-European *stena(n)g.}\]
4.3.8.

4.3.8.1.

S παρ' ἐλπίδα τεύχομαι ἄθανάτων κολάσεων, 56r (lines 25-26)
‘Contrary to hope, I will receive eternal/immortal punishment/suffering’

αν δὲ οὐδεὶς ἔλθει, 7r (line 3)

β δὲ οὐδεὶς ἔλθει, 16v (lines 15-16)

In order to explain the Slavonic variation εἰκλήθητη σοι - κίμιε in 4.3.8, we must to start our analysis by examining the nature and significance of the topos ‘eternal punishment’ in the Christian literature. We find this topos in Matthew 25:46:

Καὶ ἀπελεύσονται οὗτοι εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον οἱ δὲ δίκαιοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον

And they will go into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life

The Slavonic translation of κόλασιν αἰώνιον in Matthew 25:46 is exactly what we find in version β of the Thekara in 4.3.8. The semantic parallelism ‘eternal punishment’ – ‘eternal life’ is the focus in Matthew 25:46 and, in later patristic works on that topic.

On the other hand, the adjective ἄθανάτος in 4.3.8 is not attested in the New Testament at all. It is attested in classical Greek, but it never collocates with κόλασις, unlike αἰώνιον.

Consequently, the Thekara’s translation of κόλασις, ‘punishment’ with μοῖχη, (‘sufferings’ or ‘tortures’) is an interesting example of the close semantic relation between the concepts of ‘punishment’ and ‘torture/suffering’ in Christian theology. Biblical scholars interpret this relation differently in the Old Testament (where it is mostly causal, ‘punishment-suffering’) and in the New Testament. In the latter, the
strongest manifestation of the concept of ‘suffering’ is found in the Pauline writings, in 2 Cor 12:10, in particular: “Wherefore I take pleasure in weaknesses, in injuries, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ’s sake” (Richardson 1962: 253).

My observations on the CS data show that βεηεεε never translates ἀθανάτων in texts earlier than or contemporary to the Thekara. How, then should we interpret the lexical choice in β? I would suggest an interpretation based on contextual clues and intertextual associations related to the topos βεηεεε μνηκε.

Consider another passage from the Thekara:

4.3.8.2.
S Καὶ καταφρονητῶν τιμωρίαι ἀθάνατοι τῶν κατ’ ἐμὲ ἀθετησάντων τὰς ἁγίας σου ἑντολὰς, 54r (lines 25-26)-54v (line 1)
“And the eternal suffering of the despisers, who like me, renounced your holy commandments”
α Η ἥεληηετεβε τομεμηηή εκσημήηηη, ἵηε πο ληηή ὑερήηηηη ηε στήε ηή ζηανηεδην, 5γ (lines 15-16)
β Η ἥεηεκαεηε μευενή εκσημήηηη, ἵηε κο η η ὑερήηηηε στήε ηή ζηανηεδην 15γ (line 17)

In 4.3.8.2, unlike 4.3.8.1, β agrees in its translation with α in rendering ἀθάνατοι with εκσημήηηη. This is an indication that the translator of β was familiar with the meaning and common use of εκσημήηηη, but something in the context of 4.3.8.1 must have triggered his lexical choice of βεηεεε. I propose that that trigger was the modified noun χολάσεων, translated with μνηκε in both Slavonic versions of the Thekara. The focus of translation in β, therefore, should have been the whole collocation, ἀθανάτων χολάσεων, and not just the adjective ἀθανάτων in isolation. Evidently, the translator of β must have
tried to handle the unusual\textsuperscript{49} literal \textit{κακομπαγνυση} in collocation with \textit{μοναχα} by choosing another adjective and thus, adding slightly new (perhaps negative) connotations to the meaning expressed by the Greek word. The motivation for the collocation \textit{κακομπαγνυση μοναχα} could be sought in terms of \textit{κακομπαγνυση μοναχα} being a well-known Christian (monastic) \textit{topos}.

Therefore, the lexical choice in \textit{β} exemplifies the role of the Christian dimension in translation, which superimposes the level of semantics in a monastic discourse.

Translation \textit{α}, on the other hand, stays faithful to the Greek text, even if this resulted in a strange and, to a certain extent, oxymoronic phrase.

\textsuperscript{49} By ‘unusual’ collocation, I mean collocations that do not appear on a regular basis – for example, the English collocation \textit{scary movie}, and the unusual \textit{frightening movie}. 
CHAPTER 5

SLAVONIC LEXICAL RESPONSES TO POLYSEMY AND LEXICAL AMBIGUITY IN GREEK

5.1. Preliminary remarks

This chapter focuses on cases of polysemy and lexical ambiguity in the Greek text. We start with an example of lexical ambiguity, presented in Saeed (2003: 61):

a) Duffy discovered a mole;

b) Duffy discovered a small burrowing mammal.

c) Duffy discovered a long dormant spy.

Saeed states that example a) has two possible interpretations, b) and c), and therefore is a case of lexical ambiguity. The property of polysemy, on the other hand, is observed between related senses of a single word, as, for example, between the different meanings of the verb ‘to run.’ In other words, polysemy can be viewed as one schema with two or more clear-cut interpretations. In both cases, context is crucial; it disambiguates the

---

50 The non-semantically related senses of a word yield homonymy, as in the case of bank (the financial institution) and bank (side of a river).
lexical ambiguity helps determine which of the meanings of a polysemous word we are dealing with.

I will discuss both lexical polysemy of Greek words and polysemy on the level of grammar, i.e., in case meanings. Examples of Greek polysemy are often conveyed by an equivalent polysemous word in the Slavonic translation, but sometimes the different meanings of the Greek word are lexicalized by two different lexemes in Slavonic. Additional problems for determining the contextual meaning of the Greek word and, from there, the semantics of the Slavonic translation equivalents, come from the ambiguity or vagueness of the context, especially in lists of words. In such cases, we must attend to the various attested meanings of the Slavonic words in response to the Greek word in question, in order to establish the semantic links between Greek and Slavonic.

Thus, the reason to have a separate chapter on polysemy and semantic ambiguity stems from the specific role of polysemous words in Greek, which triggered different motivations for the lexical responses in the Slavonic translations and increased the role of the context for determining the intended meaning.

The results of the analysis in this chapter show that both translators of the Thekara were very creative and interpretative in their rendition of the Greek words. Despite the fact, that in most cases, they followed the established Church Slavonic tradition for the use of specific lexical items, they nevertheless differed in their treatment of the Greek by focusing on different aspects of the semantics of the chosen Slavonic words.
5.2. Discussion of the examples

5.2.1. Justice and Vengeance

5.2.1.1.
The lexical variation πολλετίον-πολλακλόπι is a good example of how the Slavic translators could ‘pick’ different meanings of a polysemous source word, which resulted in two different Slavonic lexemes in the translation. The word in question, δίκη, is not only polysemous in Byzantine Greek but ‘carries’ cultural baggage from the period of Classical Antiquity.

The term δίκη had the following meanings in Classical Greek: ‘custom, usage; judgment; lawsuit; trial; penalty; and vengeance’ (Liddell and Scott 1996: 430), to which we may add ‘divine judgment’ and ‘punishment’ in patristic writings (Lampe 1968: 372). Richardson (1962) observes that δίκη is found only three times in the NT, always in the sense of ‘retributive justice’ (119). The examples are from Acts 28:4, 2 Thess 1:9, and Jude 7. According to Richardson, only the example in Acts 28:4 “is true to the classical Greek conception of that dike to which both gods and men are subject” (119).

The Slavic translation of δίκη in the Apostle is the following:

Πάντως φρονεύς ἐστιν ὁ ἀνθρωπὸς οὗτος, ὅν δικαιωθέντα ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης ἢ δίκη ζήτην ὦχι εἴκασεν (Acts 28:4)
Κύριε ἐνημηκοῦ συνεδρίας ἐκτὸς γλεῖκας σὺ, ἐγὼ δὲ σπείραν ψάτη σφαλα, σαράντα χίλια ἆδη σταυρωθήσῃ (Ch; similarly in Mat)
‘No doubt this man is a murderer. Though he has escaped from the sea, justice has not allowed him to live’

σίτινες δίκην τίσουσιν ὀλεθρόν αἰώνιον (2 Thess 1:9)

They shall suffer the punishment of eternal destruction

πρόκεινται δείγμα πυρὸς αἰώνιον δίκην ὑπέχουσαι (Jude 7)

‘[the cities] will serve as an example by undergoing a punishment of eternal fire.’

All the examples of δίκη show indeed the concept of ‘punishment,’ which exhibits a particularly Christian perspective. This perspective is especially obvious in the examples from 2 Thess 1:9 and Jude 7, where the concept of ‘punishment’ is linked to the concept of ‘eternity.’ Such focus on ‘eternity’ in certain collocations is not to be found in Classical Greek texts. On the other hand, the context in Acts 28:4, highlights the “retributive justice” aspect of the meaning of δίκη, but there are no further indications as to whether this justice was delivered in court (by legal means) or by means of some other forces, which assured that justice was served.

The Slavonic translation of δίκη in the Apostle is very consistent, and it is unlikely that κακία had any (exclusively) legal connotations of ‘justice.’ The image of God punishing Sodom and Gomorrah with eternal fire from Jude 7 is a known topos in the Christian literature (including numerous commentaries in post-apostolic times); it is likely that the verbalization of this topos was memorized by the Slavic translators as well.

Given the use of κακία in the Slavonic Apostle codices, we can assume that the word carried similar connotations of ‘punishment’ and not just ‘judgment’ in version β of
the *Thekara*. The Slavonic word ἡλεκτία likewise means ‘punishment,’ but it can also denote ‘vengeance’ (where it renders Greek τιμωρία and ἐκδίκησις, Cejtlín et al., eds. 1994: 339), e.g., in Ps 17:48, 57:11, 78:10, 93:1, and Luke 18:7. Thus, it appears that ἡλεκτία and ἔως ἄν is semantically related in terms of expressing divine or human punishment.

In order to compare the consistency or lack of consistency in the Slavic translation of δίκη throughout the *Thekara*, I will refer to another passage from the text:

5.2.1.2.

S δασηρ ὑπὸ τῆς δίκης ἀπαίτηθησομαι, 62r (lines 3-4)
'I am the same person who has been punished by justice'

α ἐν εὐελ καὶ παρεδόθη ἡσταρμ ἐπιλ, 11v (lines 19-20)

β ἐν ἐπιλ ἡσταρμ ἐπιλ, 20v (line 13)

Here, we observe not only variation in the Slavic translators’ lexical choices but also in the syntactic interpretation of the Greek text. The relative pronoun δασηρ, which means ‘the very person who’ (Smyth 2002: 97), lacks an antecedent in this particular passage. This might have been partially the reason for the confusion in translation α, where the Greek was translated as if it read ὑπὸ + περί.

When we compare the treatment of δίκη in this passages and 5.2.1.1, we see that in Greek they differ in case; ὑπὸ δίκη (accusative, here interpreted as subordination, ‘under’) vs. ὑπὸ τῆς δίκης (genitive, here interpreted as instrument, ‘by the means of’; on the use of ὑπὸ in the NT, see Wallace 2000: 173). In 5.2.1.1, the Slavonic translation of both α and β interprets ὑπὸ as the subordination relation ‘under,’ by περὶ +
instrumental; this is a direct syntactic calque of the Greek ὑπὸ δίκην. In the second example, however, the translator of α provides the adverb ἰσχορθῶς ‘justly, righteously’ as a non-verbatim translation of ὑπὸ τῆς δίκης. The adverb ἰσχορθῶς also occurs in the Euchologium Sinaiticum and the PS, but there it translates the Greek adverbs δίκαιος and δίκαιον (Cejtlin 1994: 497).

Translation β, on the other hand, is consistent in rendering the Greek word in both examples by the instrumental case form of ὑπὸ, with metaphorical meaning when it uses the preposition ἐν in 5.2.1.1, and with pure instrumental meaning when there is no preposition. The lexical choice of translation α in the first example, ἐν μακτίῳ, ‘under vengeance,’ again exhibits the interpretative nature of this particular translation. Figure 5.1 gives the semantic representation of the above-discussed words and their relations. The shades of the boxes represent the degree of relatedness between this particular element of meaning in the Slavonic and Greek word; the darkest shade represents the most common translation and relation between the semantics of the Greek and the Slavonic words, while the white boxes represent no attestation of this semantic component in the meaning of the Slavic word. The red arrow represents the translation of version α of the Thekara and the blue arrow – the translation of version β.

My decision to represent the semantic structure of the Greek and Slavonic words this way was prompted by the necessity of giving the degrees of ‘commonness’ between the Greek word and its Slavonic counterpart.
Figure 5.1: Semantic representation of ‘justice’ and ‘vengeance’
I suggest two explanations for the lexical variation in both examples with δίκη. The first is that the two Slavonic translations reflect two different meanings of this polysemous Greek word. Translation β seems more consistent in its lexical choice, which displays a more particular type of ‘justice,’ with definite biblical connotations of ‘punishment’ (cf. the expression страшный суд ‘the Last Judgement’). Translation α, on the other hand, looks like a correction and interpretation of the Greek text, picking just one of the many subtle nuances in the semantics of the Greek δίκη.

The second explanation is that both Slavonic versions rendered just one sense of the polysemous Greek word δίκη, that of ‘punishment’ in 5.2.1.1. Such an explanation could be the skewing between the syntax and the lexicon in the analysis of the preposition πολ. This preposition could be interpreted as ‘being under the punishment’; we have already mentioned that the expression πολ. σοφός σωματικὸν is metaphorical.

5.2.2. Arrogance and Idleness

5.2.2.1.
S οὐάι μου, ὅτι ἀμεριμνῶ καὶ μετεωρίζομαι ἀναισθητῶν, ως μὴ ἔχων ὅλως ἐγκλήματα καὶ ὡς μὴ εἶναι κρίσιν καὶ ἀνταπόδοσιν, 61ν (lines 10-13)
“Woe unto me. Because I am free from care and feel nothing I am arrogant/I babble, as if I don’t have any complaints altogether and as if there won’t be any judgment or reward”
α γαρ οἷος ἦν ἵνα ποῖς σὲ ἡ σκέψεως, ἵνα καθὼς ὅποι ἄλλος σκέφτεσθε, ἵνα καθὼς ὅποι ἄλλος σκέφτεσθε, 11v (lines 2-5)
β γαρ οἷος ἦν ἥπερ οἰκείσσεϊ, ἵνα ἦν ἥπερ ὅποι σκέφτεσθε, ἵνα ἦν ἥπερ ὅποι σκέφτεσθε, 20r (lines 25-26)-20v (line 1)
5.2.2.2.

S 'Ελέησόν με τὸν καταφρονητὴν τὸν μετέωρον τὸν ὑποκριτὴν τὸν ἀνθρωπάρεσσον, 55v (lines 2-3)

“Have mercy on me, the despiser, the one full of himself, the hypocrite, the man-pleaser”

α Πομάδι ΜΕ, ηραδικά, ῬΥΣΗΑ, ΑΠΘΗΘΑ, ΥΑΚΩΣΗΘΗΚΑ, 6r (lines 11-12)

β Πομάδι ΜΕ, ηραδικά, ΓΑΡΘΗΘΕΙΑ, ΑΠΘΗΘΑ, ΥΑΚΩΣΗΘΗΚΑ, 16r (lines 5-6)

The meaning of the substantivized adjective μετέωρος in example 5.2.2.2. is ‘raised from the ground, on higher ground; high in the air; unsettled, fermenting, puffed up, metaphor.’ (Liddell and Scott 1996: 1120-21).

The derived verb μετεωρίζομαι has two meanings: 1) ‘to lift up oneself (positive); 2) to be arrogant’ (Kittel 1976: 4, 630). Because of the polysemous nature of the verb, Kittel claims that it is hard to fix the sense of the verb in its one NT occurrence in Luke 12:29:

καὶ ύμεῖς μὴ ζητεῖτε τί φάγητε καὶ τί πίητε καὶ μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε

‘And do not seek what you are to eat and what you are to drink, nor be of anxious mind.’

Furthermore, with respect to the negative meaning of μετεωρίζομαι, Kittel notes that “the words of Jesus have in historical exegesis been taken in both the figurative senses: 1) don’t be arrogant in your claims; 2) do not fly high, in Luther’s exegesis” (ibid.: 631). He himself accepts a more general meaning of the verb, i.e., “do not be anxious, unsettled or insecure since God guarantees all gifts” (ibid.).

In these particular passages of the Thekara, I would argue that the context allows us to interpret both μετεωρίζομαι and μετέωρος in terms of two negative characteristics: arrogance and idle/hollow language. Before I further analyze the Slavonic lexical
variation here, I would like to briefly examine the occurrences of κρύστη and
gλώματι and their derivatives in texts translated prior to the Thekara.

The Slavonic translation of μετεωρίζομαι in Luke 12:29 in all the four OCS
Gospels is κρύστη µα. The same Slavonic verb, with a similar negatively evaluative
meaning of ‘be anxious,’ translates another Greek verb, ἐπαίρω (1, ‘to lift up, to raise’; 2.
‘to stir up, excite’) in Supr 126:21: η η ἡ ποινήν ἡν ἡ κρύστη µα (µή ἐπαίρον) ‘And
don’t be anxious about his fall.’ However, the verb κρύστη µα has another meaning
which is central to Christian doctrine – Christ’s ascension, as in last chapter of Luke,
24:51, where Jesus, after showing himself to the disciples, makes his final ascent into
heaven: ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, κρύστη µα ἡν ἡ (µ)], ‘[He] was carried up
into Heaven.’

The verb κρύστη µα is semantically related to κρύστη µα; it is used in the
meaning of ‘ascend’ in Supr 232:12 and 513:10, rendering the verb ὑψῶ, ‘to lift high,’
to raise up’ (Cejtlin et al., eds. 1994: 123). The derived noun κρύστη µα, on the other
hand, is attested primarily with the negative meaning ‘arrogance,’ e.g., in the Zograph
Folia: Εὐθὺς οὖν αὐτοῦς ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης εἰς ἑπαραν συμβαίνει βλάπτεσθαι, τοῦ θε
κρε[ε] συ πρῶα ἀπὸ κρύστη µα σιμβελεῖ σα ἀνὴ παρίστα (κρε)εδικαθ (Minčeva 1978:
42-4), ‘here at first from elevation/arrogance harms befall them.’ The derivational
doublet of κρύστη µα, κρύστα, is also used to convey negative connotations:
In sum, just as the Greek verb μετεωρίζομαι and its derivatives display two meanings depending on the context, so the Slavic translator of version α of the Thekara seemed to be familiar with the semantic potential of Slavonic εξελίσσειται αλα and its related noun.

More interesting is the situation in version β. The verb that is chosen in this version, глаголит αλα, translates μετεωρίζομαι with the meaning ‘to babble,’ ‘to chatter,’ otherwise seen in the Rila Folia and Supr 277:9 (Cejtin et al., eds. 1996: 171):

Πεκλη αλα παζτακεμνην κα γαλαμον αλα (RF)
‘Caring for corporal [things] and babbling’

οι καλοι δοκιμασται μετεωρηχοτες και ουκ εψευσθησαν
δεσμην κε εκκαυζυμην γαλαμεζυν αλα και η κειλαγεια (Supr 277:9)
‘The good assayers when/as chattering idly/speaking arrogantly, did not lie’

The Slavonic глаголмишта αλα translates another verb, ἀδολεσχέω, ‘talk idly’; ‘talk against’; and ‘meditate’ in the Psalms:

κατ’ ἐμοῦ ἐδολέσχουν οἱ καθήμενοι ἐν πύλῃ, Psalm 69:12 (68:13)
Ὡ λβντε γαλαμαζης εικα σεκαλεσει εν ερατεχ (PS)
‘They that sit in the gate talked against me’
However, nowhere among the occurrences of μετεωρίζομαι in Classical or Patristic Greek was I able to find a meaning related to ‘speaking.’ Strong’s definition of the metaphorical meaning of μετεωρίζομαι could be a clue to the semantic association ‘arrogance’ – ‘arrogant talk.’ Strong defines the meaning of μετεωρίζομαι “by a metaphor taken from ships that are tossed about on the deep by winds and waves: 1. to cause one to waver or fluctuate in the mind 2. to agitate or harass with cares; and 3) to make anxious” (Strong). The causative meaning of ‘to agitate’ and ‘to make anxious’ could be the link to the component of ‘speaking,’ which is found in the Slavonic ρανταμιάτι τα: X agitates Y by speaking (arrogantly). Thus, the meaning ‘to speak idly’ could be metaphorical (‘be arrogant’ – ‘speak arrogantly’). It is unclear, however, when (if at all) such semantic association (‘to be arrogant’ – ‘to speak idly’) occurred and when the Slavs took upon it in their translations.

However, there is one lead in respect to this semantic association, which involves the word ἁδολεσχία (‘idle talk’). The word γανταμαθήθηκε, which appears in the first Slavonic redaction of the Psalter, is said to translate correctly ἁδολεσχία in Psalm 118:85 (Thomson 1998: 805). However, Thomson also observes that the word ἁδολεσχία can mean ‘meditation’; thus, it was wrongly translated with γανταμαθήθηκε in the NP in Psalm 54:3. The translation in the NP is viewed by Thomson as an example of one of the most common errors in Slavonic translations, where the wrong meaning of a polysemous word has been taken (ibid.).

The root of ἁδολεσχία is also part of the derived compound μετεωρολέσχης attested in the Chronicle of Manasses of the 14th century and translated with
The same Greek word μετεωρολέσχης is translated with выкоколагазалымн in the Chronicle of Georgius Amartolos in a 13th-14th century copy (Avanesov, ed. 1988-: II, 250).

My suggestion with regard to the semantic component of ‘idle talk’ in μετεωρίζομαι is that it was not probably present in Classical and Koine Greek but that, later on, because of the links of μετεωρίζομαι to certain Greek compounds such as μετεωρολέσχης, the meaning ‘idle talk’ started to be perceptible in μετεωρίζομαι as well. It is obvious that, in the Thekara, the translator of β was already aware of the meaning ‘idle talk’ and thus chose to translate just one aspect of the semantics of μετεωρίζομαι.

In short, the Greek verb μετεωρίζομαι was apparently polysemous; its polysemy is reflected in two different translations in earlier Slavonic texts: ЕВЗИСИМТЕ ζά/ЕВЗИСИМЯ ζά and ГАМЫМТЕ ζά. This lexical variation is also seen in the Thekara, where each of the two Slavonic words rendering μετεωρίζομαι focuses on a different aspect of the meaning of the Greek verb. Translation α focuses on the psychological characteristics (state) of arrogance through a metaphor, while translation β emphasizes the associated kinds of speech acts. The Greek verb μετεωρίζομαι probably conveyed both meanings in Byzantine times, but the Slavic translators of the early texts and of the text of Thekara chose to lexicalize the two meanings in two separate, if semantically proximate, lexical items. Therefore, we should view the Slavonic lexical variation ЕВЗИСИМТЕ ζά/ЕВЗИСИМЯ ζά...
and a matter of the translators’ idiosyncratic choices, one which emphasizes one particular meaning (state or speech act) of the Greek verb μετεωρίζομαι.

5.2.3. Wrongdoing: Injustice-Harm-Insult

S ἄδικία, 53r (line 8)  
‘wrong-doing/injustice/insult’

α ἁμαρτία, 4r (line 10)

β ἁμαρτία, 14r (line 19)

We continue with a word quite common in both Classical and Byzantine Greek, ἄδικία. The semantics of this word covers a large number of lexical fields, all related by the general concept of ‘wrongdoing.’ In our analysis of the lexical variation in example 5.2.3, we will show the realizations of this ‘fuzzy’ semantics in Slavonic and try to determine the lexical mapping between Greek and Slavonic in regard to the conceptualization and lexicalization of meaning.

The word ἄδικία in this particular example is present in a long list of sins, a typical feature of monastic texts, which has its prototype in the Pauline epistles and, in particular, in Galatians 5:19-21. Such lists usually do not provide enough context to determine the connotations of the Greek or of the Slavonic words in the translation.

Before I analyze the lexical semantics of both Slavonic words, I would like to comment on their derivation. Evidently the word in version α, ἁμαρτία, is a structural calque of the Greek ἄδικία. The derived adjective ἁμαρτία, and the agentive noun ἁμαρτία, are both described as ‘real structural calques, first of all from the
viewpoint of privative formation...which spread in the Byzantine-rite Slavic languages under Old Slavic influence’ (Molnár 1985: 222-223).

In order to analyse the nuances in the meaning of неправедно and севолю, I provide examples of both words in context and in their regular collocations:

1. ἐκ τῆς καρδίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἱ διάλογισμοί οἱ κακοὶ ἐκπορευόνται ...μοιχεῖα, πλεονεξία, πονηρία... Mark 7:21-22
   ὅτι ζὸν ἅλκα πολλοῖόννες νεκράτα...ταταξα, σεβολία, απεκαλύπτο (M; similarly in Z and A)
   ‘Out of the heart of man come evil thoughts...thefts, covetousness, wickednesses’

   ‘Earth filled up with injustice’

   ‘The righteous man will turn away from his right deeds and will commit lawless/nonrighteous deed/sin’

4. ἔλεη νεπρλάκν οὐκ σταφεράτω (Supr 50:4)
   ‘What [kind of] insult you harmed us’

5. σεβολίαι καὶ [ἀδικεῖσθαι] οὐ τοῦ σεβολία καὶ λιχωπεία, “To be offended by offenders and money-grabbers” (Dionysius the Areopagite, 14th c., quoted in Avanesov, ed. 1975--: XII, 50)

6. μὴ ἐλπίζετε ἔπε ἀδικίαν, Psalm 62:10 (61:11)
   ‘don’t trust in unrighteousness’
It is obvious that the word ἰησωμᾶς cannot be substituted for ἐθάνατος in example 2, since the connotations of the former are ‘unjust/wrong deeds committed.’

In examples 3 and 4, the verb ὑποταμίζει (‘to do Y, to perform Y’), due to its very general meaning, allows for free variation between ἰησωμᾶς and ἐθάνατος.

It is also interesting to analyze the use of ἰησωμᾶς and ἐθάνατος in verb collocations in order to see how the receptor language handles the middle and passive semantics of the Greek source verbs and to also provide more details about the semantic roles of the Slavonic verbs related to ἰησωμᾶς and ἐθάνατος.  

51 I use the standard semantic notations for agent (X) and patient or experiencer (Y) in order to generalize on the particular instances of the Greek and Slavonic verbs.
Îáèäà (‘to receive harm/damage/insult’) translates the middle/passive verb `áðêíêèéíóçìà`. Here the word òèéà is never replaced with íåïðàâüäà. The causative collocation òèéà íèâîðèòè (‘to do harm/damage/wrong deed’) translates two active verbs: áðêíêèé and ëéíîñèáçìà. The verb ëíîñèáçìà is used in the Bible in several meanings: ‘to insult,’ ‘to slander,’ ‘to treat abusively’ (cf. Luke 6:28), ‘to use despitefully,’ ‘to threaten.’. In addition, there existed an active (causative) verb òèéà íèâîðèòè as well as a reflexive one, òèéà íèâîðèòè çà. By contrast, the only verb derived from íåïðàâüäà was the rare active verb íåïðàâüäîâàòè, attested in Church Slavonic: Íè áî îïå÷àëüíàãî. íî îïå÷àëèâúøàãî âåäåòú ê íåìó, ïîíåæå áî îíú íåïðàâäîâà, ‘He leads not the offended but the offender to him, because it is he who did wrong’ (14th-century copy of the Pandects of Nikon of the Black Mountain, quoted in Avanesov, ed. 1988-: V, 333).

Presumably, the collocations with both òèéà and òèéà íèâîðèòè take experiencer arguments, while íåïðàâüäîâàòè is used intransitively.

Both verbs òèéà íèâîðèòè (çà) and íåïðàâüäîâàòè are verba sentiendi. According to the Russian semanticist Elena Padučeva, the difference between emotions is not the nature of the emotion per se, but what has provoked it. Furthermore, the psychological (emotional) state is provoked not by the events themselves but by how the subject thinks about (reacts to) them, which is expressed through verba sentiendi. In these terms, the psychological

---

52 Cf. Алена огорчит твой отъезд (‘Alena will be hurt by your leave’) = Алена будет огорчена, когда ты уедешь (the time of the event). In the second example, Padučeva perceives the information in the subordinate (time) clause to be the reason for the psychological state of the subject. The complete analysis of verba sentiendi can be found in Padučeva 2004: 273-306.
state in the verb ἐβηλαληθ could be described as provoked by some information about
certain events. In the lexical variation of the Thekara, ἥπαβλαδα and ἐβαλαδα are the events
that cause the psychological state of ἐβηλαληθ ζα. The very fact that there is no verb
ἡπαβλαδοραθ with a diathetic semantics justifies the idea that the meaning of ἐβηλαληθ
ζα can be only experiencer-oriented.

In Figure 5.2, the semantic representation of ἥπαβλαδα and ἐβαλαδα, both in OCS
and later texts, including the Thekara, will give a clearer picture of the relations between
various semantic components of the words and the degree of overlap among them.
It is clear from Figure 5.2 that the semantic components of the Slavic words do not overlap completely except in one meaning, WRONGDOING, which belongs to the most general semantic entry (the superordinate of the class). The rest of the semantic properties either show only a partial overlap or none whatever.

Figure 5.3 offers a different representation of the distribution of semantic features in the Slavic words alone with relation to ἁδικία and shows the associative links between the semantic fields of each word:
Figure 5.3: Semantic representation of the moral and physical acts of ‘wrongdoing’
On the basis of associative relations between the basic (core) and contextual meanings of the two Slavonic words (the latter developed and motivated to a large degree by the semantics of the various Greek words they translated), we can assume that they both underwent semantic extensions or shifts, but in different directions: ἡμηράμελα – in the direction of MORAL ACT (‘sin’), and ἡμηριά – in the direction of PHYSICAL ACT (‘harm’). It goes without saying that the boundaries between the semantic fields of each word are fuzzy; there is a substantial overlap and uncertainty about how close each semantic field is to the semantic classes of MORAL ACTS and PHYSICAL ACTS. This kind of semantic representation is also an example of what Cruse calls a ‘semantic continuum,’ a heuristic procedure, used by him to track the path of ‘metaphorical extension’ (Cruse 1989: 74).

What Figure 5.3 shows is that ἡμηράμελα and ἡμηριά are neither full synonyms nor in free variation in any given context. Moreover, if we review their occurrences as NPs governed by various verbs, we will see that they are selected by particular verbs: ἡμηράμελα (Y): ‘X commits Y,’ ‘X cleanses (+self) from Y,’ ‘X turns away from Y,’ ‘X is filled with Y’; ἡμηριά (Y): ‘X experiences Y,’ ‘X suffers Y,’ ‘X is in (the state of) Y,’ etc. The verbs that select ἡμηράμελα as their complement clearly and ubiquitously display the semantic role of X as AGENT, while the semantic role of X in verbs that select ἡμηριά is most often that of an EXPERIENCER.

All these facts show the complex history in the semantic interplay of ἡμηράμελα and ἡμηριά, which one has to take into consideration when analyzing the lexical variation.
in late Slavonic translations from Greek. My conclusion is that the variation ἡπαθῶν-εξηλῶ in this particular passage of the *Thekara* is probably due to the translators’ idiosyncratic choices, based on their perception of the differences in the semantic fields of both words as well as the semantic roles of the verbs. I cannot claim that these differences were clearly realized by the Slavs who wrote the two Slavonic versions of the *Thekara*, but the fact is that they did use two different words to render the same Greek word. At this point, I can only hypothesize about the semantic relation between the two Slavonic variants and take this relation as a point of departure for interpreting the motivation of this variation.

5.2.4. Care and Sorrow

S ωςι μοι ὅτι ἄμεριμνῶ καὶ μετεωρίζομαι ἀναισθητῶν, ὡς μὴ ἐχων ὃλως ἐγκλήματα καὶ ὡς μὴ εἴναι κρίσιν καὶ ἀνταπόδοσιν, 61ν (lines 10-13) 
“Woe unto me, because I am free from care and feel nothing, I am arrogant/I babble, as if/since I don’t have any complaints altogether and as if there won’t be any judgment and reward”

α γορέ μην ἢκα οὐ παρό σε ν ἐξηλήσαλα σε η νὐκτερᾶς, ιακοζ ζην οὐ νηνιν στρεψενίν, ἤ ἢκα ιεσεμ ἠφας τ ἐξηλήσε, 11ν (lines 2-5)
β ογερο μην ἢκα σεπεπελασης, η ἢκα η νηνιν ζην στρεψενίν, ηνεκ ἢκα η δε βε βι βε ζην στρεψενίς, γαφίαν σε νυκτερᾶς, 20τ (lines 25-26)-20ν (line1)

The lexical variation here illustrates the common variation found on OCS and later recensions in rendering the Greek α-privatum by means of either οὐ or εξ (see 4.2.1.). The former functions as a negative particle here, and the latter as a prefix. However, when we analyze this lexical variation further, it turns out to exemplify editorial work on the part of the translator of α.
The Greek word ἁμεριμνέω seen in 5.2.4 means ‘to be free from anxiety, care-free’ (Lampe 1968: 86). Its antonym is μεριμνέω, which is usually translated by the most common meaning of the Slavonic verb πειμή ς, ‘to care,’ as in Luke 12:26: τί περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν μεριμνάτε, γιὰ τὸ καὶ προφητικὰ πεντε σα (‘Why do you care about the rest’); and Matthew 6:28: καὶ περὶ ἐνδύματος τί μεριμνάτε, ο ὀλικαμί πητο σα πεντε (‘And why do you care about clothing’). However, there are two other less common meanings of πειμή ς: ‘to put in an effort’ and ‘to grieve.’ This situation is not surprising from an etymological point of view; cf. Buck’s observation on Indo-European languages that “there is much overlapping in use between words for ‘care,’ ‘sorrow,’ and ‘anxiety’” (Buck 1949: 1121).

The meaning ‘to grieve’ is attested in the Savvina Kniga, where πειμή ς renders another Greek verb, λυπέω ‘to grieve, to distress’:

καὶ λυποῦμενοι σφόδρα ἡρέχαστο λέγειν αὐτῷ εἰς ἑκατοσ τος, Matthew 26:22

η χρησιμίτης τολο ἡμαίων γαλάθ ai ρο (Z; similarly in M and A) vs. πειμή ς in SK ‘and being exceedingly grieved, they began saying to him.’

The occurrences of the Slavonic verb πειμή ς suggests that it was polysemous and had the potential to render different Greek verbs. In the context of the Thekara, the choice of this verb in translation σα is the closest to the Greek original, as its meaning maps semantically onto the primary meaning of the Greek source verb.
The verb in translation β, ἐκπευδάλῳ, had slightly different connotations than ἔπεις σα. Its antonyms, πεύκλην σα/πεύκλησθι σα, are always intransitive; they match one of the secondary meanings of πεμή σα, ‘to grieve’ – for example, μη ἀθυμήσης σφόδρα ἀδελφέ, ἔπεις σα ζελώ θατε, ‘Don’t grieve so much, brother’ (Supr 526:13). The adjective ἐκπευδάληθα, on the other hand, stands for the Greek ἁμέριμνος in its meaning of ‘care-free [person]’: Matthew 28:14: καὶ ὡμᾶς ἁμέριμνος ποιήσομεν, ἔκ ἐκπευδάληθα στροφήμ (A) (vs. ἐκ πεύκα, Z, M, SK), ‘And rid you of care,’ literally, ‘we will make you free of care.’

The meaning of ἁμέριμνεω causes additional problems for our interpretation of the Slavonic lexical variation. The context in example 5.2.4 could be interpreted both ways: as referring to a state of ‘having no anxieties’ or to a stronger emotional state of ‘not grieving.’

If we suppose that ἁμέριμνεω was used in the Greek text of the Thekara in its primary meaning of ‘to have no anxieties,’ then we should look into the lexical choice of version β more closely. It is difficult to determine whether version β in the Thekara used the verb ἐκπευδάλῳ in the same manner as the adjective ἐκπευδάληθα in the Gospel text in OCS. If that was the case, then we can say that the lexical variation ἔπεις σα-ἐκπευδάλῳ was just a matter of derivational variation, with no reference to semantics.

53 We must add that ‘being free from anxieties,’ at least in regard to one’s own shortcomings, is not a positive quality in monastic contexts; example 5.2.4 from the Thekara appears to be in accordance with this observation.
After all, both words have the same root, *pek-* (with phonemic alternation k–č due to the first palatalization of velars in Proto Slavic) and it is quite plausible that in later periods of Church Slavonic, their meanings became similar, ‘to be care-free.’

There is a second possibility, however – that the verb έκπειλασθή in version β did not mean ‘to be care-free’ but realized its other OCS meaning, ‘to not grieve’ (cf. the Slavonic translation in *Supr* 209:11 and 526:13), in which case, the particular passage from the *Thekara* would read as follows:

"Woe unto me. Because I don’t grieve, and as if I don’t have any sins altogether and as if there won’t be any judgement or reward, I babble, feeling nothing."

We have to note here that the meaning ‘not to grieve’ for ένεπαλάγη is attested in *Supr* 526:13 as a translation of the Greek μὴ ἀθυμήσθης (‘to be disheartened,’ ‘despond’). This shows that the Slavonic ένεπαλάγη commonly rendered different Greek verbs, which had different basic meanings. Hence, one or the other meaning of ένεπαλάγη, ‘to be care-free’ or ‘not to grieve,’ could have been realized in different contexts depending on which Greek verb was in the source text: ἀμεμνήνεω or ἀθυμέω.

The fact that one Slavonic word could translate two or more Greek words is a common phenomenon, observable in OCS and later texts. Moreover, there is a semantic basis for the presence of both ‘to be care-free’ and ‘not to grieve’ in the meaning of ένεπαλάγη – the closeness between the concept of ‘no anxieties’ and ‘no sorrows.’
No matter what interpretation we choose in the end, it is important to be aware of the various diachronic and synchronic semantic layers in the meaning of the Greek and the Slavonic words in this particular context. Only after we exhaust our analysis of the semantic potential of the lexical items under discussion, can we propose certain scenarios about the mechanisms of translation.

5.2.5. Preference and Choice

S ἴδονας καὶ πάθη ὁ παράφρον τοῦ φόβου σου καὶ τῆς ἀγάπης σου ἀνθαπούμενος 55r (lines 8-10)
‘The one who is mad chooses/prefers pleasures and passions over/instead [of] your fear and love’

α σάλστη καὶ στύτη ἐγισσήν πᾶσιν ἐκαθήν ἡ λουσὲ τῶν πρέψουνται. 5v (lines 20-22)
β σάλστη καὶ στύτη ἐγισσήν πᾶσιν ἐκαθήν ἡ λουσὲ τῶν ζηγέρας, 15v (lines 17-18)

This passage is evidence of the translators’ way of handling ambiguity in the semantics of Greek cases – in this example, the prepositionless genitive case of τοῦ φόβου. There are two possible interpretations of this phrase: as genitive of comparison or as genitive of distinction. Since there are no firm contextual clues as to which meaning this is, the Slavic translators interpreted this passage in two different ways, thus making both the possible contextual meanings of the Greek genitive case concrete. Overall, the sentence reads quite oddly in Slavonic because both α and β translated the middle participle ἀνθαπούμενος with a 1Sg form of the verb; this makes the phrase sound more personal, whereas the Greek phrase is impersonal. Analysis of the lexical variants πρέψουνται and ζηγέρα will provide us with more data about the translation decisions analyzed above.
I will start with a short note on the distribution of the word πρέποντας in OCS and later texts. The word seems not to be well attested; in fact, it is cited only in the Pandects of Antioch and in the “Life of Nikon” in a Reading Menaion for April (Sreznevskij 1971: II, 1638).

The Greek deponent verb ἀνθισμένομαι has the following meanings: ‘to choose one person or thing instead of another’; ‘to dispute’; ‘to lay claim’ (Liddell and Scott 1996: 138). Thus, technically speaking, the verb ἢζημαθη in translation β is a better choice here: ‘The one who is mad chooses pleasures and passions instead of your fear and love.’ Here the translation of the Greek τοῦ φόβου is as a genitive of distinction, in accord with the translation of the participle ἀνθισμένος. In translation α, ἀνθισμένος is translated as ‘prefers,’ and τοῦ φόβου is accordingly treated as a genitive of comparison: ‘The one who is mad prefers pleasures and passions more than your fear and love.’ This translation, despite its general affinity to the Greek text, has different connotations. Moreover, the Slavonic translations reflect two different cognitive mechanisms: 1) choice, which is an act of will; and 2) preference, which is an inclination.

A handy example of the relationship between ‘choice’ and ‘preference’ comes from the case of presidential elections: a person can be inclined towards one party or political leader, but he might end up voting for a different candidate. Similarly, in the present passive, the translator of α advised the monk what to feel, while the translator of β recommended to him what to do – in both cases, by prescribing a negative example.
Viewing the lexical choice of the Slavic translators along these lines means that we have to transcend the linguistic level of analysis and look for the cognitive objectives of each translator’s choice.\footnote{Cf. Neubert and Shreve’s appeal to translators to “account for the cognitive content of the communication and use language in that accounting” (Neubert and Shreve 1992: 37).}

Even though they chose different translations for the participle \( \dot{\alpha}n\theta\imath\rho\omicron\upmu\omicron\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \), both translators agreed in rendering it grammatically with a 1Sg verb. Such a shift in the meaning from Greek to Slavonic can be viewed as a pragmatic decision, which transformed the Greek proverbial (impersonal) discourse into a more confessional and personalized one. Thus, I argue that such agreement between the two Slavonic groups point to one original translation, which must have been later subject to individual editorial work.

The analysis of this particular passage from the \textit{Thekara} text is an example of how we should approach Slavonic lexical variation - namely, not in isolation but in its lexical and syntactic environment. This will show us not only the systemic linguistic relationships that exist in translation, but also the cognitive basis of the translators’ choice. As noted in Chapter 1, this has unfortunately not been a common practice among the researchers who deal with Slavonic lexical variation; thus, their analyses suffer from the limitations of working exclusively on the lexical rather than on the clausal, textual, or discourse level.

We started our analysis of example in 5.2.5 with an ambiguity on the grammatical level between the genitive of comparison and genitive of distinction, which was reflected in the Slavonic translations. As we worked along, we discovered another lexical
variation, between the verbs ΙΖΕΨΑΛΤΗ and ΠΡΕΔΑΝΩΝΗΤΑΝ. In doing this, we took a rather linear approach to the Slavonic translation, working our way from the beginning of a sentence to the end. As it turned out, the grammatical feature of contrast between the two expressions ΠΑΛΕ ΕΟΙΖΗ and ΕΛΕΡΕΤΟ ΕΟΙΖΗ is related to the lexical choice of the predicate in the given sentence: ‘prefer’ or ‘choose.’ Choice is cognitively and semantically determined by the presence of a set of possible items; hence, choosing is picking one item instead of another, whereas there is a certain aspect of telicity in the conceptualization of choice. Thus, there is a definite mapping between the semantics of the lexical items ΙΖΕΨΑΛΤΗ and ΠΑΛΕ and a cognitive reality. The lexical items participating in the semantic scheme of ‘preference’ can be viewed the same way, except that there is no focus on telicity.
CHAPTER 6

REINTERPRETATION OF GREEK IN THE SLAVONIC TRANSLATION

6.1. Preliminary remarks

This chapter focuses on salient cases of reinterpretation of Greek words in the Slavonic translations of the *Thekara*. This reinterpretation could be motivated by linguistic factors such as metaphorical extensions, the realization of semantic overlaps, and pragmatic inferences; and non-linguistic factors such as the monastic orientation of the text.

The examples that I analyze here demonstrate the interpretative nature of the Slavonic translations and their sometimes unexpected lexical decisions. In this respect, the lexical variants that are discussed in this chapter are by no means synonyms or lexical doublets. They can be understood as pertaining to the same Greek word only by interpreting the translator’s motivation for their selection in the particular context. Therefore, these lexical variants stand separately from most of the lexical variants in the Slavonic translation of the *Thekara* by virtue of their strong ties to specific contexts, outside of which they may be regarded, to a great extent, as semantically unrelated lexemes.
6.2. Discussion of examples

6.2.1. ‘Indifference’ and ‘Lack of Thought’

P οὐάι μοί ὅτι ἐν ἀκηδίᾳ καὶ ἀδιαθορίᾳ, καὶ ἐν λογισμοῖς αἰσχροῖς τὸν δοθέντα μοι καιρὸν πρὸς μετανοιαν κατανάλωσα, 17v
S οὐάι μοί ὅτι ἐν ἀμέλειᾳ καὶ ἀδιαθορίᾳ, καὶ ἐν λογισμοῖς αἰσχροῖς τὸν δοθέντα μοι καιρὸν πρὸς μετανοιαν κατανάλωσας διετέλεσα, 61v (lines 7-9)

‘Woe unto me that in inertia/negligence and indifference and in evil thoughts I have wasted my time, which was given to me for redemption’

α γορε λίνε ιακό καβ ηγαδάθνη κα καβαδάθκηνη κα καβ πολίκακες σκεπθήνη δάνην καν καθή καμ καθή πολλάκια ἴνηπηρη, 11r (line 23)-11v (lines 1-2)
β σοβυ λίνε ιακό καβ λανηκη κα καβ πολικές καλή δάνην κακ κακ κακ κακ πολλάκια ἴνηνηρη, 20r (lines 23-24)

The existing literature on lexical variation in Slavonic translations has tended to neglect the role of pragmatics in explaining lexical choices. In fact, the choice of translation α in example 6.2.1 is motivated precisely by pragmatic implicatures in the use of two lexical items -- ηγαδάθνη κα καβαδάθκηνη. While the latter is the focus of my analysis, some preliminary remarks on the meaning and usage of the former are also necessary.

The deverbal noun ηγαδάθθη, unlike the verbs ηγαδάκτη κα ηγαδάκτη, is not very common in OCS and later texts. The associated deverbal nouns translate the Greek ἄμέλεια, ‘indifference,’ ‘negligence’ or καταφρόνησις, ‘contempt,’ ‘disdain’ (Avanesov, ed. 1988-, V: 347):

Μᾶς ηγαδάθθη (ἄμέλεια) ἰμπρέζην, ὑκοῦτε ἠρῶντίς καὶ πριηκάλιμέ κα. κα ηγαδάκτη κα κα κα βάλανης ἰκήθες κα κα ηγαδάκτη κα (14th-century copy of Theodore the Studite’s Spiritual Instructions).
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‘About contempt, that is, about indifference, it is evil and sinful to neglect all matters.’

In 6.2.1, version ά of the Thekara indeed translated ἄμέλεια with ἁραδνημικ, and this lexical choice is consistent throughout the whole text of the Midnight Office. The semantics of ἁραδνημικ here includes the dimension of ‘morally inappropriate behavior for a monastic community,’ the ‘mental and/or behavioral state of apathy.’ In this respect, the meaning of the Greek passage given above is liable to reinterpretation by the Slavic translators because of the different aspects of the state of apathy that could be in focus: the cause of this state (laziness, negligence) or the results (mental destitution). In order to determine what was indeed the focus in translation ά we need to look at the meaning of ἄδιαφροια and the lexical choices of both Slavonic versions.

The meanings of ἄδιαφροια include ‘indifference’ and ‘carelessness,’ aptly rendered by ἁραδνημικ in translation ί. 55 By contrast the word ἁράκομαιμην in version ά does not appear to translate ἄδιαφροια accurately. As the OCS attestations show, the most common meaning of the positive deverbal noun ἁράκομαιμη and the associated verbs is ‘discernment’ or ‘judgment’:

1. οὐκ οὖν ἔχεις ἁράκομαιμην λογικήν \(\text{Supr 169:4}\), no Greek text
‘The good thing that appear to your judgment’

2. τὸ μὲν πρόσωπον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ γινώσκετε διακρίνειν \(\text{Mt 16:3}\)

55 It is important to mention that there is corruption in Group 2 of the Greek text, which yields ἄδιαφροια, a word with positive Christian connotations, ‘incorruption, chastity, lack of decay’ (a sign of the sanctification of the physical body). This positive meaning clearly does not “fit” the context in 6.2.1.
That you know how to discern the face of the sky.

3. καὶ πίνεις μὴ διακρίνον τὸ σῶμα (τοῦ κυρίου) 1 Cor 11:29
   ἐν διακριτρίᾳ τῆς γεύσεως (Mat, Str, and Ṣ) vs. ἐν διακριτρίᾳ τῆς γεύσεως (Athonite redaction, see Xristova 2004: 232).
   ‘without discerning the (Lord’s) body’

The Greek verb translated by ῥαςκόγλαθι could be also rendered by other Slavonic verbs with a bit less positive meaning:

4. ἐὰν ἔχετε πίστιν καὶ μὴ διακρίθητε, Mt 21:21
   ἐν διακριτρίᾳ ἡ ἡ διακριτρίᾳ σα (M; similarly in Z and Ἄ)
   ‘If you have faith and never doubt’

5. καὶ μὴ διακρίθη ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, Mark 11:23
   ἡ διακριτρίᾳ σα ἐν καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ (M; similarly in Z and Ἄ)
   ‘and does not doubt in his heart’

The heterogenous data from the Slavonic translations of the Gospels of Mark and Matthew as well as 1 Cor 11:29 show the semantic distinctions that the Slavs made when they translated the polysemous verb διακρίνειν, which is attested in several meanings in the NT: “1. to separate, make a distinction, discriminate, prefer; 2. try, decide (decide a dispute), give judgement; 3. to desert; 4. oppose, contend; 5. hesitate, doubt” (Strong).

The situation in the Slavonic translation of the Apostle shows that ῥαςκόγλαθι occurs predominantly in the Athonite redaction. In 1 Cor 12:10, Greek διακρίσεις πνευμάτων (‘spiritual judgement/distinction/decision’) was translated with ῥαςκόμετεν (‘discernment’) in the Archaic redaction, but with ῥαςκόγλαθι in the Athonite redaction.

In Heb 5:14, the Slavonic translation of the expression πρὸς διάκρισιν demonstrates
again the same distribution of words as in 1 Cor 12:10: καὶ ἐλαχιστά ἑνώ in the Archaic
translation versus καὶ ἐλαχιστά ἑνώ in the Athonite redaction (Xristova 2004: 368).
According to Xristova, “the translation in the Athonite redaction is more precise, but it is
difficult to say which of the two translations (the Archaic or the Athonite) is better. All
passages with the Greek verb κρίνω and its derivatives point to a meaning ‘judgement’
and from there – understanding” (ibid.: 621).

The example from Supr 169:4 does not have an attested Greek source, but the
meaning of κακοψύχειν is clearly something like ‘judgment, discernment.’ On the other
hand, the example from Matthew 16:3 does not have the meaning ‘judgment,’ but rather
‘discern’ or maybe ‘comprehend’ as a semantic extension.

The Slavic translations of the negated verb διακρίνειν in Matthew 21:21 and Mark
11:23 in examples 4 and 5 present a different picture. The meaning of the Greek
dιακρίνειν there covers a different lexical field, one of ‘doubt,’ so the Slavonic translation
uses a verb with the basic meaning ‘to doubt’ – σύγκλητικά ἢ.

From these attestations of the Slavonic words related to the negative form of
κακοψύχα in OCS and later texts, it is clear that the meaning of this word does not
“match” directly the meaning of ἀδιάφορία. However, we can look at the primary
meanings of διακρίνων and ἀδιάφορία ‘(lack of) distinction,’ ‘(lack of) discrimination,’
‘(lack of) discernment,’ ‘(lack of) difference,’ and ‘(lack of) separation’ being situated
along a continuum within one lexical field, the field of DISTINCTION, which could have
various lexical manifestations. If we accept this interpretation, then the lexical choice of
version $\alpha$ does not look that odd and is in agreement with the Slavonic translations of 1 Cor 11:29 in the Athonite redaction of the Apostle.

Another interpretation of the lexical choice $\text{ἐνέκαθη}$ in $\alpha$ is that it was triggered by the semantic and pragmatic relations between $\text{ἐνέκαθη}$ and $\text{ἐνέκαθεν}$, signifying the ‘state of apathy’ or ‘spiritual destitution.’ The lexical choices of version $\beta$ to express this particular mental state point to a more literal translation, providing two close Slavonic synonyms to describe the specific states of mind of ‘apathy’ and ‘carelessness’/ ‘indifference.’

By contrast, we can argue that the translator of $\alpha$, without much altering the general meaning of the Greek text, nevertheless made some changes that emphasized not only the complete state of apathy, which is already conveyed by the word $\text{ἐνέκαθη}$, but also the result of that state, namely, the ‘lack of possession of one’s mental faculty due to the previous state of apathy.’\textsuperscript{56} In other words, he took the virtual synonymy of $\text{ἀμέλεια}$ and $\text{ἀδιάφορία}$ as an implicature, in accordance with Grice’s Maxim of Quantity, and selected a translation that eliminated the redundancy. (Grice’s Maxim of Quantity states: “1. Make your contribution as informative as is required. 2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required”).\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{56} In their research of the lexical semantics of the New Testament, Nida and Louw also implement the notion of “implicature” with respect to the semantic relations between the different class meanings of the Greek $\chiρίς$ (Nida and Louw, eds. 1992: 68). The term ‘conversational implicature’ was introduced by Paul Grice. It refers primarily to the observation that speakers often imply rather than directly refer to things and the listeners have to form an inference in order to understand the speakers’ implications.

\textsuperscript{57} For a comprehensive analysis of Grice’s maxims of conversational cooperation, see Saeed (2003: 204-7).
6.2.2. ‘Indifference’ and ‘Spiritual coldness’

S ὅδε ἀδιάφορία, ἐκεῖ δὲ οἱ σκότωσης, 56v (lines 6-7)
“Here indifference, there – worms”
α ζᾶν νεμαζόμενον, τὰς γηραίας, 7γ (lines 8-9)
β ζᾶν προχλαδήσει, τὰς γηραίας, 16v (line 20)

This passage is part of the same paragraph-long text contrasting life on earth and life in Hell that was discussed in 4.3.4.2. The paragraph is built on syntactic parallelism and semantic contrast, which makes the analysis of the lexical variation within this paragraph a challenge for the researcher because of the scarcity of contextual clues.

The word in question in this passage, ἀδιάφορία, has already been the object of analysis in 6.2.1. Therefore, we should not be surprised at the lexical choice reflected in α, because it is consistent throughout that translation. What is interesting here is the choice of version β, προχλαδήσει.

The word προχλαδήσει is attested in Supr 94:19 in the meaning of ‘refreshment,’ but there it translates the Greek word ἀναψυχή, not ἀδιάφορία: ἡ ἥρετη ἡ αγάς ἡ προχλαδήσει. This is a direct quotation of Psalm 66:12 (65:12), καὶ ἐξῆγαγες ἡμᾶς εἰς ἀναψυχήν (‘but you brought us out into a place of refreshment,’ Brenton). Slavonic Psalters show variation between προχλαδήσει (NP) and ποκεν (PS) in this particular context.

The passage of the Thekara is difficult to interpret due to the paucity of contextual and pragmatic clues; the passage is a part of a long paragraph built on the syntactical parallelism ὅδε (‘here’) – ἐκεῖ (‘there’), which, in this case, contrasts two different
terms: ‘indifference’/‘inertia’ and ‘worms.’ I can only hypothesize about the lexical choice of version $\beta$ and propose two explanations for this choice.

The first explanation has to do with the way the translators may have viewed the rhetorical organization of this particular passage. It is not clear whether the Greek text unites or contrasts the two concepts, $\text{\`{a}di\`{a}for\`{i}a}$, ‘indifference’ and $\text{o\`{i} s\`{a}\`{o}l\`{i}k\`{e}s}$, ‘worms’; in any case, the Slavic translator of $\beta$ chose to contrast them (“we live easy on earth but won’t in hell”), probably as an allusion to the Psalter, where the general meaning of Psalm 66:12 is that, after we have experienced some hardships, ‘Thou [God] hast brought us out into a place of refreshment.’

The second explanation is based on a reference to Revelations 3:15-16:

1. Οίδα σου τὰ ἔργα ὅτι οὐτε ψυχρός εἰ οὐτε ζεστός. ὃθελον ψυχρός ἦς ἡ ζεστός (3:15)
2. οὔτως ὅτι χλιαρὸς εἰ καὶ οὐτε ζεστός οὐτε ψυχρός, μέλλω σε ἐμέσαι ἐκ τοῦ στόματός μου (3:16)

‘I know your works: you are neither cold nor hot. Would that you were cold or hot; So, because you are lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spew you out of my mouth.’

What is of interest here is the underlined adjective ψυχρός. The Greek word ψυχρός has both literal and figurative meanings in the New Testament: “1. cool, cold; 2. cold, i.e. sluggish, inert” (Strong). Together with the dictionary meaning of this word, we have to be aware of the meaning of the whole passage in order to understand the Christian connotations of ψυχρός. The reason we focus on this particular adjective is because its usage in this context and its Slavonic translation, in particular, can provide a clue to the choice of translation $\beta$, προχαδάθεν, and its possible metaphorical reading.
The Christian connotations of ψυχρός, viewed in the context of Revelations, are discussed by Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown (1974). They interpret the passage from Revelations 3:15-16 as follows:

The antithesis to ‘hot,’ literally, ‘boiling’ (‘fervent,’ Ac 18:25; Ro 12:11; compare So 8:6; Lu 24:32), requires that ‘cold’ should here mean more than negatively cold; it is rather, positively icy cold: having never yet been warmed. The Laodiceans were in spiritual things cold comparatively, but not cold as the world outside, and as those who had never belonged to the Church. The lukewarm state, if it be the transitional stage to a warmer, is a desirable state (for a little religion, if real, is better than none); but most fatal when, as here, an abiding condition, for it is mistaken for a safe state (Re 3:17). This accounts for Christ's desiring that they were cold rather than lukewarm. Also, there is more hope of the ‘cold,’ that is, those who are of the world, and not yet warmed by the Gospel call; for, when called, they may become hot and fervent Christians.

Accordingly, we can infer that the adjective ψυχρός was used in its figurative meaning, referring to the boundaries that delineate the spiritual state of the Laodiceans. The Slavic translation of Revelations 3:15-16 also reflects the figurative meaning of the Greek word.58

If we return to our text of Thekara, we will see that the noun ἄδιαφροία means ‘indifference,’ ‘inertia’ just as ψυχρός in its figurative sense means ‘inert.’ I would argue that the translator of θ might have meant the word ἀρρχαίναι (‘growing cold’) not in its literal meaning, but in its figurative meaning. Thus, the translation of θ should read: ‘Here [on earth] coldness/apathy/inertia – there [in hell] – worms.’

58 It should be noted, though, that the text of Revelation has had a marginal role in the Eastern Christian tradition (except among the Russian Old Believers), and thus has not been as prolific a source of citations as the other NT texts. Nevertheless, this text was translated and was copied in the Slavic lands, and monks who were interested could read it in Slavonic.
Such an explanation is not unjustified, if we evoke Revelation imagery and the interpretation of spiritual inertia there. However, this need not imply that the Slavic translator of ἄριστος made a reference directly to the particular passage of Revelation or that he knew it by heart. It is quite possible that he had never heard it before, but was aware of the metaphoric meaning of ‘coolness.’ Thus, he presented the same spiritual and metaphorical meaning as in the Greek text by using metaphorical imagery to refer to ‘apathy.’ In other words, he did not simply translate the Greek word, but offered his own interpretation of what he perceived to be a state of inertia.

6.2.3. ‘Hateful to God’ and ‘Improper’

One of the many instances of self-effacing discourse in the Thekara comes from one of the prayers for the Midnight Service. The vocabulary in the prayer is very much influenced by the Psalter’s penitential discourse and features numerous deprecatory epithets referring to the “unworthiness” of the one praying. One such epithet is ἄθέσμων, which denotes the semantic field of ‘MORALITY EVALUATION,’ with the concepts of ‘lawless’ and ‘wicked’ as core members.

The word ἄθέσμων is not very common in Greek. It is attested once in the Septuagint and twice in the New Testament, in 2 Peter 2:7 and 3:17, where it appears as a substantive. In 2 Peter 2:7 it refers to the Sodomites and their godless behavior; in 2 Peter 3:17, to heretical leaders, “mockers of Christ” (Kittel 1976: 1, 167). In the Slavonic
translation of the Apostle, in 2 Peter 2:7 we find the word ξεκόηνηκά and the variants ξεκοήνηκά (Archaic translation) and ξενήστημα (Athonite redaction) in 2 Peter 3:17. Xristova, who analyzes this particular lexical variation, states that it is one of the numerous cases where one word was replaced with another in the Athonite redaction of the Apostle, perhaps aiming for a better equivalent (“пo-точнo съoтветствиe”) of the Greek word. She acknowledges, however, that both the Archaic and the Athonite version of 2 Peter 3:17 are faithful to the Greek word ἁθέσμων (Xristova 2004: 406).

I would add here that the Archaic translation ξεκόηνήκά is actually a calque of the word ἁθέσμων, since the root “the(s)m” implies something that is laid down or established, i.e., law. The Athonite redaction is actually faithful to just one of the meanings of the Greek word, but not the basic one – ‘(morally) corrupt.’

Before I examine further the Slavonic lexical variants in the Thekara, I would like to provide one more example of ἁθέσμων from the Thekara text to show how the Slavic translators render ἁθέσμων in other contexts:

S καὶ ἐνώπιον τῶν φοβερῶν καὶ ἀγίων ἀγγέλων σου, ὑπὸ τοῦ ἴδιου μου συνειδότος κατακαμπτόμενος, προσφέρω σοι τὰς ἁθέσμους μου πράξεις, 59v (line 26) - 60r (lines 1-3)

‘And before your severe and holy angels, bending down from/through my conscience, I bring to you my wicked deeds’

α ἐν πρέ ἁσται καὶ ἀγία κατὰ τὸν τρόπον, ἡ μυς ἀλήθεια ἄλλη, προνοοῦσι τὴν ἐποίησιν, 10r (lines 2-5)

β ἐν πρέ ἁστικὴ καὶ ἀγία κατὰ τὸν τρόπον, ἡ μυς ἀλήθεια σάλλεθε, προνοοοῦσι τὴν ἐποίησιν, 19r (lines 16-18)
Almost all of the Slavic dictionaries give the Greek word θεοστυγής as the basic equivalent for the adjective ἐγωμερθήκαμεν, which is found in translation α. The word θεοστυγής only occurs once in the New Testament, in Romans 1:30, as a substantive meaning ‘hateful to God’ (‘God-haters’). The connotations of the Greek word imply very strong consequences indeed for one’s spiritual life, especially if the subject is a monk.

Version β demonstrates a different approach to or rather interpretation of the Greek word. The adjective ευζεκτήσαμεν, although correct and meaningful within this context, is not otherwise attested as a translation of ἀθέσμων. Ordinarily, this adjective translates the Greek ἄτόπος, which has the following four meanings in the New Testament: “1) out of place, not befitting; 2) improper, wicked; 3) unrighteous; 4) inconvenient, harmful” (Strong). Only in one case in the NT, in 2 Thess 3:2, do we see ευζεκτήσαμεν as the translation of ἄτόπος:59

Καὶ ἵνα ῥυσθῶμεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἄτόπων καὶ πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων
Ἡ ἄνθρωπον ἐν χίλιοι οἰκονομοι ἐν ἐννεακατὰκοῦννημα χάκα (Ch; similarly in ᾽δ) ‘and that we may be delivered from wicked and evil men.’

It is difficult to say what the exact meaning of ευζεκτήσαμεν is in this passage: it could refer to the behavior of these men, ‘improper,’ ‘wicked’ or even ‘harmful,’ or else to their

---

59 In the other two occurrences of ἄτόπος, Acts 28:6 and Luke 23:41, the Slavonic translation is τὰλα, ‘evil.’
nature, ‘wicked’ or ‘unrighteous.’ Each of these words has semantic properties that overlap with the semantic properties of the other words, but each also exhibits some differences with respect to the focus on human nature or behavior.

In Figure 6.1, I offer a representation of the semantic field of ‘MORALITY EVALUATION’ with the elements ‘LAWLESS-WICKED-STRANGE-IMPROPER’ in the Greek and Slavonic translations, together with the Thekara’s attestations, which are represented by the red (version α) and the blue (version β) arrows:

\[ \text{Figure 6.1: Semantic representation of ‘morality evaluation’} \]

The representation in Figure 6.1 shows the different points of similarity along a semantic continuum: there is no one-to-one correspondence between the Greek and the Slavonic semantic elements of the field of ‘MORALITY EVALUATION.’ It is quite interesting that, in the case of нечестъ, physical or perceptual characteristics have been employed by the Slavic translators in order to convey the meaning of a ‘morally corrupt

---

60 In modern Bulgarian the word нечестъ has a different prefix, нечестен, and the word means ‘inappropriate.’
person.’ While some of the Slavonic equivalents are structural calques of the Greek (κομπέτωρ for ἀτοπος, κομμαρίσκε for Θεοστυγής), others are more interpretative and stand for one or more elements within the general lexical field.

I would like to offer two possible scenarios for the translation choice in α, εἰςμφύκκος. The first one takes into account the visual similarity between the Greek words ἀθεσμὸς (‘lawless’) and ἀθεος (‘denying God,’ ‘godless’). Obviously, the Greek roots “thesm” and “the” are different and denote different things; however, they could have been easily confused by a Slavic translator, especially if they were written under titla. However, due to the strong two-way causative relation between ‘lawless [deed or person]’ and ‘ungodly [deed or person],’ based on Classical Greek moral and legal principles and, later, Christian ethics, it is possible that the words ἀθεσμὸς and ἀθεος overlapped in their primary meanings. If they did, as I hypothesize in my second scenario, and the Slavic translator of α was indeed aware of that, then his translation of ἀθέσμον as εἰςμφύκκος was due not to a confusion of similar spellings, but to a conscious realization of the overlap in meanings.

The lexical choice in translation β, κεκακτημένη, is not a calque of Greek ἀθέσμον, nor does it conveys any of its meanings in a straightforward manner. How can we, then, explain this choice? I propose that we interpret the meaning of κεκακτημένη in this particular context as ‘improper’ rather than ‘out of place’ or ‘strange.’ The given meaning is semantically related to ‘bad,’ especially in monastic circles, where improper behavior would be considered “bad.” Moreover, the real-world context of this whole passage, namely, repentance, does not allow for a reading such as ‘strange deeds,’ but rather calls
for ‘bad (inappropriate) deeds.’ Thus, the different lexical choices of translations α and β are both faithful to the Greek text, as they interpret, each in its own way, the ethical element in the act of self-abasement as a necessary condition for repentance. One evaluates behavior as “improper” while focusing on the relation to God as a departure point (version α); the other emphasizes one aspect of this behavior, its “inappropriateness” (version β).

6.2.4. ‘Stinking’ and ‘ Emitting a smell’

S ύς δούλος δεσπότας ύποτάξομαι ταίς ἡδοναῖς, ταίς δυσῳδίαις καὶ ἁμαρτίαις ὀσμῆν ἀποζούσας, 66r (lines 1-3)

‘And like a slave [is subject to his] master, I am subject to pleasures, which stink with a bad and sinful smell’

α ιακο ράβα βαίτε ποινηνος σε σαλτε, ἧνε ζασσράδῃ καὶ γραξονης κοινοι σκεφταιμ, 15r (lines 19-21)

β ιακο ράβα βαίτε ποινηνος σε σαλτε, ζασσράδῃμε καὶ γραξονης κοινοι σμφλατιμ, 23v (lines 4-5)

The lexical variation here is between the Slavic dative plural present active participles σκεφταιμ и σμφλατιμ, which both translate the Greek Dative plural present active participle αποζούσας. The choice of α here, σκεφταιμ, is clearly not what the Greek participle conveys. In order to understand what might have prompted this choice, we should look at the meaning and the uses of not only the Greek and Slavic participles, but also at their collocations: ζασσράδει καὶ γραξονης κοινοι.

Greek dictionaries agree on the primary meaning of ὀσμή as ‘smell’ (Liddell and Scott 1996: 198, Lampe 1968: 192) and ἀποζω as ‘to smell.’ Obviously, what we see in
the Greek text here is a rhetorical device, the so-called ‘cognate accusative’ ὁσμή with a participle of the same basic meaning, i.e., ‘smelling a smell.’

Version β correctly gives θύμω, which translates one of the meanings of the primary entry for this particular derivational class, the verb θώ. The semantics of θώ encompasses two opposite meanings: ‘to smell nice’ and ‘to stink’; it is only through context that we can decide on which meaning is present. In contemporary Bulgarian (and English, for that matter) there are two ways to express these two opposite meanings: 1) through a single lexeme, мириша, which requires additional contextual cues (most often, adverbs) to determine which meaning is being used: мириша лошо ‘I smell bad’ vs. мириша хубаво ‘I smell nice’; 2) through different lexical items (i.e., lexicalized meanings): воня or смърдя ‘I stink’ vs. благоухах ‘I smell nice’. The context in this passage of the Thekara clearly points to the negatively evaluative meaning of θώ ‘to stink.’ In addition, the previous clause, which contains the antecedent of τὰ θάρα, the noun ἡθοναίας (‘pleasures’), also validates this reading, given the monastic (ascetic) orientation of the Thekara: ’…the [carnal] pleasures, which stink with a bad and sinful smell.’

All of these contextual and extralinguistic (cultural) clues support the translation in β, which not only preserves the meaning of the Greek text but also manages to keep the structure of the Greek cognate accusative intact. Additional support for my interpretation of the translation decision of β stems from tradition, namely, from the attested uses of θύμω in OCS codices of the Gospel according to John 11:39, and in other texts such as the Prolog for March, quoted by Miklošič 1977: 865) in a 17th-century Serbian copy: θύμω μιν θώμα.
As this particular passage in the Thekara does not provide any clues as to why the translator of α chose a completely different lexeme, we must compare the usage in two other passages. One uses the same verb, ἀποζωόμενα, and the other the same verbal root with a different prefix but basically with the same meaning, προσοζωόμενα.

1. 
S δυσωδίας ὀσμὴν ἀποζωόμενα, 62r (line 21)  
‘Stinking with a stench of an evil smell’
α  ἄλωσιμαλάλ Βοννοί  ἁμαρτήμα, 12r (lines 10-11)
β  ἄλωσιμαλάλ Βοννοί  ἁμαρτήμα, 20v (lines 25-26)

The second passage is an exact quote from Psalm 38:5 (37:6), ‘My bruises have become noisome and corrupt, because of my foolishness’:

2. 
S Προσοζωόμενα καὶ ἐσάπησαν οἱ μάλωπές μου ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς ἄφροσύνης μου, 65r (lines 3-5)
α  ἄλωσιμαλάλ Χέε η σαγχνηε ῥανη ηο ε ἀνία εξεβιά μοε άε, 14v (lines 4-5)
β  ἄλωσιμαλάλ Χέε η σαγχνηε ῥανη ηο ε ἀνία εξεβιά μοε, 22v (lines 20-21)

It is clear from the above passages that the translator of α was aware of the Psalter quotation (as only monk would have been) and knew the meaning of the Greek verb ὀζωόμενα. The question, then, is why he decided to use another, seemingly vacuous verb, σκακρισματιμένα (‘to do, to accomplish, to create’) in 15r, and thus deviated from the semantics of the Greek text. I would argue that this was a deliberate choice, not made out of ignorance, which presents a rather dynamic meaning of the whole passage: ‘pleasures, which create a bad and sinful smell.’ Such a meaning would be very much in accord with the monastic
perception of ‘pleasures’ as “dynamic, ongoing (vs. static) temptations” that require a strong resistance.61

Another possible explanation for the translation decision in α is stylistic: the translator might have been avoiding the cognate accusative. Since the idea of ‘odor’ is already conveyed by the noun βοήθα, the verb αὔρηξας is redundant in this context and can be replaced by the relatively general verb ἀρκεῖον (‘to do,’ ‘to make’). It is true that we have not found in OCS or in later texts any attested collocations of βοήθα and ἀρκεῖον, but semantically such a collocation is quite plausible if we interpret the verb ἀρκεῖον in its existential meaning of ‘make’ as in the example ‘a source X [pleasures] releases an emission [scent]’62 – i.e., the scent comes into existence. What we observe here is a semantic (re)interpretation in the form of a metonymic shift from the basic (primary) meaning of the verb to a secondary (or derived) existential meaning. In the present case, this shift is not very far-fetched, since the verb ἀρκεῖον, when collocated with any object, yields an existential situation: ‘make or create X’ implies ‘X comes into being/existence.’

61 By referring to extralinguistic factors such as monastic attitudes, I follow the functional approach to translation, which takes into account not only the grammatical structures of two languages, but also their communicative and pragmatic contexts. “Language in use and language as system presuppose one another. Both approaches assume that human interaction is a patterned, rule-governed use of linguistic signs. The formal structures described by linguists are internalized through communicative interaction” (Neubert and Shreve 1992: 38).

62 Cf. Berkeley FrameNet project and its description of the ‘EMITTING’ frame: “In this frame, a Source Emitter discharges its Emission along a Path or to a Goal.” <http://framenet.icsi.berkeley.edu/>
Still, in order for the verb to communicate such an existential meaning, it needs to be put in a particular context where the existence of the object (the smell, in our case) becomes the central component of meaning. In offering such an analysis, I have been influenced by Padučeva’s analysis of ‘shift of focus of attention’ in contemporary Russian (2004: 158).

6.2.5. ‘Abruptness’ and ‘Inclemency’

S ονδε φησι μακροθυμία, ἐκεῖ δέ ἀποτομία. 56v (lines 1-2)
‘Here, (he says) – long suffering/patience, there – abruptness/hastiness’

α σακε βε ἀληθητικήν, ταλμε ἡπομενήν, 7r (line 4)
β βε ἀληθητικήν, ταλμο ὑστυγήν, 16v (lines 16-17)

Example 6.2.5 is part of the same paragraph on the contrast of the earthly life and life in Hell, which we already discussed in 6.2.2. In the present example, I focus on the role of specific rhetorical devices in order to explain the lexical variation in the Slavonic translations. The trigger for the variation is ἀποτομία. This noun and its derivatives appear several times in the NT. Some of these occurrences are given below:

1. γράφω ἵνα παρὼν μὴ ἀποτόμως χρήσωμαι 2 Cor. 13:10
   ‘I write this in order that when I come I may not have to be severe …’

2. ἵδε οὖν χρηστότητα καὶ ἀποτομίαν (ὑστυγήν) θεοῦ Ro 11:22
   ‘Note then, the kindness and severity of God’

Padučeva argues that the semantic component can have in its initial usage a trivial status of a logical result, but that in its derived use, this trivial status may become central. For example, most verbs presume existence of their subject as a trivial result, cf. Соловьи поют (‘Nightingales sing’) > Соловьи существуют (‘Nightingales exist’).
The adverb ἀποτόμως has been interpreted as “denoting the power of Paul’s sharp judgment which might result in the destruction of the community” (Kittel 1976: I, 109). In a similar fashion, Kittel clarifies the meaning of the second passage, from Romans 11:22: “Those who do not cleave to God’s goodness are threatened by the inflexible hardness and severity of the Judge” (ibid.: 109).

It is obvious from the above-cited Slavonic translations of NT passages that the common words for translating ἀποτομία and its derivatives were ἐκσέβεσθε (‘abruptness,’ ‘sharpness’) and ἐκσέβη; the former is the one we find in the Thekara’s translation β. There, the translator’s decision might have been prompted by a familiarity with the Slavonic Apostle, but it could have also been a result of other factors.

If we take into consideration the rhetorical organization of this particular passage in the Thekara, we see that the word in translation β better “fits” the context of the antithesis Δινώσκειν ἕπειρος ‘long suffering/patience’ (one of the common Christian virtues) vs. ἐκσέβη, ‘sharpness/severity.’ The antithesis could have also been reinforced by the syntactic parallelism of this particular passage (“here X, there Y”) and the whole paragraph.

Version α, on the other hand, is once again more interpretative by using ἔπειρα, a word with the more spiritual (monastic) connotation of ‘inclemency, mercilessness.’ Such a reinterpretation of the basic meaning of ἀποτομία is not so far-fetched, since there are cases of ἀποτομία in some apostolic writings where ‘inclemency’ appears to be the contextual meaning of the Greek word.
The lexical variation ʰɛ̂ɾˈkʰɛ̂- ʰɛ̂ɾˈkʰɛ̂ could be also viewed as part of the semantic frame ‘COMPASSION/FORGIVING/KINDNESS.’ The reference to ‘mercy’ is salient in the root of ʰɛ̂ɾˈkʰɛ̂, but more opaque or contextual in ʰɛ̂ɾˈkʰɛ̂. Thus, the difference would be in the focus on different aspects of the signification of the lack of compassion: ‘no mercy’ (ʰɛ̂ɾˈkʰɛ̂) vs. ‘severity’ (ʰɛ̂ɾˈkʰɛ̂).
CHAPTER 7

SLAVONIC LEXICAL RESPONSES TO THE SEMANTIC AND CONCEPTUAL COMPLEXITY OF GREEK IMAGERY

7.1. Preliminary remarks

This last chapter of my analysis of the Slavonic lexical variation in the Thekara examines the specific status of imagery in translations. Finding a translation equivalent in the target language to metaphors in the source language has proven to be a difficult task. The main reason for this is the non-matching nature of the associative links in the conceptualization of different semantic categories in the source and the target languages. Therefore, in my analysis I will adopt some of the approaches of cognitive linguistics in order to reveal the conceptual scheme behind the lexical choices in the Slavonic translation.

The main types of metaphors that are discussed in this chapter are these related to the category of emotions and those that are socio-culturally-bound. Both types of metaphors have extremely fuzzy conceptual boundaries; this situation is particularly perceivable in cases of translation. My task here is to try to determine the nature of the associative links that lead to the metaphorical imagery in both the Greek and the Slavonic
texts and, thus to account for the nature of the lexical variation in the Slavonic translation.

In some cases, the associations that the Slavic translators of the Thekara made were already attested in previous Church Slavonic works. This fact could be interpreted as the presence of more universal types of metaphorical associations, which are not prompted by the immediate context.

7.2. Discussion of the examples

7.2.1. The heat metaphor

We start with one very common metaphor in languages – the metaphor of the ‘burning heart.’ Both the Greek and the Slavonic in version α display the common path of associations between ‘heat’ vocabulary and emotions, so-called ‘heat metaphors.’

Several examples from English that demonstrate the point include ‘anger was boiling inside me,’ ‘his remarks made me boil,’ ‘she was still quietly simmering from her interview,’ ‘why is he stewing over that information?’

The examples are taken from the website of the FrameNet project <http://framenet.icsi.berkeley.edu> and are part of what the creators of the project call ‘Emotion-Heat’ frame.
Ungerer and Schmid (1996) discuss the nature and path of the heat metaphors, following the classical research of Lakoff and Johnson (1980), Lakoff (1987), and others. The interpretation of ‘ANGER’ in Lakoff and Johnson as “the heat of a fluid in a container” has become one of the most quoted phrases in the field of cognitive linguistics. Ungerer and Schmid discuss the mapping between categories of ‘HEAT’ and emotions in this light, as they find the possibility of such mapping in the rich conceptual background of HEAT vocabulary (‘steam,’ ‘boil,’ ‘fume,’ ‘burst’) and in the fact that the HEAT metaphors are based on ‘one of the most basic spatial experiences, the be-in-something relation’ (1996: 133). Furthermore, the authors provide a representation of the actual path of associations between heat and anger: “Anger is Heat > Anger is the Heat of a Fluid in a Container > The Body is a Container for Emotions” (Ungerer and Schmid 1996: 134). The relation to ‘body’ is viewed in physiological effects of emotions: increase or drop in body temperature, sweating, etc. (1996: 132).

These preliminary remarks regarding the metaphoric relation between HEAT and emotions will be our point of departure in the analysis of the lexical variation in example 7.2.1. Consider first the following Slavic translations from Greek:

καὶ ἐκέλευσεν ἐνεχθῆναι λαμπάδας πυρὸς καιρομένας, ἦν ποιεῖτε πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν

καὶ ἀκρατείᾳ ἐρωτεύεται, ἦν γραμματικὸς ἀναγκαῖος, ἥν γραμματικὸς ἀναγκαῖος, ‘And he ordered [them] to bring a burning candle,’ Supr 13:1-2

καὶ διακατεὶ ἐρωτεύεται, ἦν γραμματικὸς ἀναγκαῖος, ‘burning with love,’ Supr 273:30

In Greek, the meaning of the verb καίω, ‘to burn’ (prefixed διακατεὶ, ‘to burn through’) can also extend metaphorically to the sphere of emotions, giving ‘to burn with passion.’
In the *Thekara* the Greek verb ἀναβράζω, which also belongs to the ‘heat’ vocabulary, has the meanings ‘stir up,’ ‘make boil,’ ‘boil up,’ and ‘bubble’ (Lampe 1968: 96). The last meaning is attested in the Homilies of Ephrem the Syrian. Unfortunately, I have not found any examples of Slavonic translations of ἀναβράζω in the existing literature.

The example from *Supr* 273:30, quoted above, shows that the Slavonic present active participle гре́митъ can be used metaphorically to denote emotions – ‘love,’ in this particular example. This is, in fact, what we would expect, given the nature of the relations between heat vocabulary and emotions explicated in cognitive linguistics. Thus, the translation of version α is expected and also evidence that the translator of α had mastered Greek and Slavonic metaphorical imagery. He apparently knew the literal meaning of the verb ἀναβράζω but was also familiar with the metaphorical extension in which this meaning can participate.

The odd translation of version β, on the other hand, is what prompts us to look further into the possible metaphorical associations that arise from the literal meaning of the verb θακοτάθη. The collocations in which this verb participate are few:

1. δύο γάρ ὄρνεα χαλάσουσίν σε εἰς κοχλάζοντα λέβηταν
   δέ εἰς πιθήκη ἐπεφίλησε τὰ ἐκ θακοτάθη κόμη (Supr 233: 22)
   ‘Let two birds sink in the bubbling caldron’

2. γεγονότα θακοτάθη (Izbornik of 1076, quoted in Avanesov, ed. 1988-: IV, 221)
   ‘Bubbling river’
3. ‘There many men and women were lying, and they were bubbling as in a caldron’

(Sbornik of homilies from Trinity Monastery, 12th-13th century, quoted in Avanesov 1988-: IV, 221).

Example 1 shows the regular collocation of кокотати and its derivatives to denote the process of boiling in a container, associated in an onomatopoeic manner with the sound of bubbling water. Examples 2 and 3 are metaphorical images based on associations between the sound of water bubbling in a container and, in example 2, the sound of a river or the sound of crowd, respectively.65

Example 4 is interesting because it exemplifies the associative links between heat vocabulary and emotions based on the physiological effects of the latter. The metaphor кипят в Paleia of 1406 is similar to the metaphor in version β of the Thekara. Both seem to be based on the connection between the sound of the bubbling in a container and the sound of a pounding heart as a physiological result of high emotional states. Although based on the regular associations between heat vocabulary and emotions, the lexical choice of β (кокотати) offers a more innovative path to such imagery by emphasizing the auditory side rather than the degree of heat of the physiological expression of emotions.

65 All these three collocations of the Slavonic verb кокотати and their meaning are still alive in modern Bulgarian, cf. кокочещ казван, кокочеща река, кокочещо множество от мъже и жени.
7.2.2. The defilement metaphor

Example 7.2.2 presents an interesting case of lexical variation between the actual image on which the metaphor is based (‘mud,’ in version β) and the final, already interpreted result of the metaphoric associations (‘defilement,’ in version α). The metaphor in Greek is based on associations between ‘covering one’s body with mud’ (thus, making it dirty) and ‘spiritual defilement.’ The Greek verb in question, βορβορό, is said to have the literal meaning of ‘to smear with mud’ and the figurative meaning of ‘to defile.’ The figurative meaning is not present in Classical Greek, but it occurs in the works of the patristic writers John Chrysostomos and Ephrem the Syrian (Lampe 1968: 301). Thus, it is important to know that, already in the time of patristic Greek, the verb βορβορό had acquired the spiritual connotations of ‘defile.’

The translation of βεβοβοβοβογ in β, οκκλακκκκ, is straightforward; it denotes the actual result of ‘smearing oneself with mud.’ However, when we combine the two parts of the expression οκκκκκακκκα (lit., ‘muddied by gluttony’), we see that this expression is not literal at all. It combines the two parts of the metaphor, the literal part (or the point of departure) and the comparative part (or the point of similarity). In other words, just as when one is literally covered with mud, one is viewed as “unclean” and even “shameful,” so the act of gluttony is perceived as “impure,” based on the “shameful”
behavior of excessive eating.\textsuperscript{66} This image receives an evaluative focus, rooted in the very nature of the monastic code of behavior.

In focusing on the actual means of defilement, ‘mud,’ the translator of \( \beta \) allows the reader to make the metaphoric associations himself, granted that such associations were available in the conceptualization of ‘defilement’ in the language at that time. The fact that the translator of \( \beta \) did not opt for conveying the abstract concept of ‘defilement’ directly, but chose a word that denotes exactly what the mechanism of physical defilement is, does not necessarily mean that he was not familiar with the already present metaphorical sense in the Greek verb \( \beta \rho \beta \rho \rho \omega \), which could be actualized in different contexts. He might have been aware of the metaphorical sense, but just decided to make the metaphor more lucid and thus, perhaps, more expressive and vivid.

The lexical choice in version \( \alpha \) could be viewed as the result of the translator’s knowledge of the metaphorical element in the meaning of \( \beta \rho \beta \rho \rho \omega \) or as a result of his own interpretative work on joining the image of ‘mud’ and the concept of ‘defilement.’\textsuperscript{67}

One of the most famous examples of this concept is in Mark 7:18:

\begin{quote}
\begin{small}
οὐ νοεῖτε ὅτι πᾶν τὸ ἐξωθεὶν εἰςπορεύμενον εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον οὐ δύναται αὐτὸν κοινώσαι
\end{small}
\end{quote}

\( (M) \)

‘Do you not see that whatever goes into a man from outside cannot defile him.’

\textsuperscript{66} A different path of associations for the ‘defilement’ metaphor, based on the behavior of pigs, was suggested by Predrag Matejic in private communication: wallowing in mud > pig > gluttony.

\textsuperscript{67} In most European languages, the image of ‘dirt’ is associated with ‘impurity,’ both in the literal and the metaphorical sense.
In sum, the nature of the lexical variation in example 7.2.2 could be analyzed as focused on the abstract concept of ‘defilement’ in version α without any depiction of how such defilement might develop, and in version β with a metaphorical depiction of one actual mechanism of ‘defilement,’ being covered with mud.

7.2.3. The ‘compassionate womb’ metaphor

7.2.3.1
S πώς ἀνελεήμονες καὶ ἀπαράκλητοι καὶ ἀσπλαγχνοι οἱ ῥομφεύοντες ἄγγελοι, 62v (line 26) - 63r (lines 1-2)
‘And how merciless, non-compassionate and heartless your sword-carrying angels are’

α Κακός ομαλοσθείνην καὶ ομογενελικήν καὶ κακὸς ὁ μικρὸς αἶμαν, 12v (lines 13-14)

β Κακός ομαλοσθείνην καὶ ομογενελικήν καὶ κακὸς ὁ μικρὸς αἶμαν, 21r (lines 23-24)

7.2.3.2.
S Καὶ χυβέρνησον ὡς γινώσκει ἡ ἐσπλαγχνία σου ἐνεκεν τοὺς πλῆθος τῶν ἀνθρώπων σου, 65v (lines 3-6)
‘And guide [her] so that your compassion knows because of your many mercies’

α Μὴ ὁρεῖς καὶ μὴ διχαινέσῃ καὶ μὴ ἄρεις ἀπὸ τοὺς φίλους σου, 15r (lines 1-2)

β Μὴ ὁρεῖς καὶ μὴ διχαινέσῃ καὶ μὴ ἄρεις ἀπὸ τοὺς φίλους σου, 23r (lines 12-14)

7.2.3.3.
S ἐμφάνισον κύριε τὴν ἱσχύν τῆς ἐσπλαγχνίας ροπῆς σου, 65r (lines 20-21)
‘Display, God, the strength of your compassionate help/inclination’

α Καὶ ἐστὶ οἰκεῖον τὴν ἐσπλαγχνίαν τῆς προέδρου, 14v (lines 16-17)

β Καὶ ἐστὶ οἰκεῖον τὴν ἐσπλαγχνίαν τῆς προέδρου, 23r (lines 5-6)

7.2.3.4.
S μὴ κλείσεις τὰ ὠά τῆς ἐσπλαγχνίας σου ἐν τῇ ἔλεεινῇ σοι τὰῦτῃ καὶ καταδιώκει τῇ σοι, 52v (line 17-19)
‘Do not close the ears of your compassion in my pitiful and painful prayer’

α Καὶ ἐπιθυμεῖς καὶ μὴ ἀκοἴνως τοῦ ἐσπλαγχνίαν τῆς ἐπιθυμεῖς καὶ μὴ ἀκοἴνως τῇ σοι, 3v (lines 19-21)
All of the Greek examples in 7.2.3 form a cognate group of words associated with ‘compassion’ as a metonymic extension of the intestines, which were considered the seat of love and compassion. The semantic representation of the Greek cognate group and its Slavic counterparts attested in OCS and later texts is given below. I suggest, on the basis of the data presented below, that the благо- composita were not that common in the early OCS period, if known at all as translations of the cognate Greek group associated with ‘compassion.’ They developed and eventually took over the OCS group with the root милосрд- later, probably during the Athonite (or pre-Athonite) revision of the books. For comparison, I also give the Thekara’s lexical variation and the Greek words in Figure 7.1.
Figure 7.1: Semantic representation of ‘womb’/ ‘heart’
The core word of the net in Figure 7.1, σπλάγχνον, was used by the Greeks to denote the seat of various emotions and later, in the Old and the New Testament, to translate the Hebrew word for ‘bowels’ (Buck 1949: 1085). In the Hebrew interpretation, the bowels were thought to be the seat of tenderer affections and compassion (Strong).

The derived verb σπλαγχνίζομαι occurs 12 times in the NT in the meaning ‘to have pity,’ ‘to feel sympathy.’ According to Strong, the verb’s meaning shifted from literal to metaphorical: “to be moved as to one’s bowels, hence, to be moved with compassion (for the bowels were thought to be the seat of love and pity).” It is worth mentioning the context of occurrence of σπλαγχνίζομαι in the NT: it mostly refers to Jesus and his compassionate attitude towards the crowd and the sick.

The derived adjective εὔσπλαγχνος occurs twice in the NT, in Eph 4:32 and 1 Peter 3:8, where it is translated with μισμέρα (Šišatovac Apostol), while the negative adjective ἀσπλαγχνος is not attested in the NT at all.

In the OCS translation of the Slavonic Gospels, we find only the word μισμέρα for σπλάγχνον; there is variation between μισμέρα and μισμέρα in Matthew 15:32 (Lysen 1995: 212):

Σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ἢδη ἢμέραι τρεῖς προσμένουσιν μοι καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν τί φάγωσιν, Matthew 15:32
μισμέρα, ἕκας ὅσις τῷ λαῷ προσκυνῆσαι μὴν ἴησεν μηδὲ ἴησεν γεγενημένῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ προσεύχοντες (M; similarly in Z and A) vs. μισμέρα, SK
‘I have compassion on the crowd, because they have been with me now three days, and have nothing to eat.’
The same verb μιλαφρύλωτον is also a common translation of another Greek verb, ἐλεέω, ‘to have pity on, show mercy to’ (Supr 57:10).

In the Slavonic Apostle, in Col 3:12, we find the word ἐκτρέφει for σπλάγχνον in the meaning of ‘bowels’:

Εξέδύσασθε οὖν... σπλάγχνα οἰκτίρμοι Χρεστότητα..., Col 3:12
Θελεῖτε οὖν... εἰς ἐκτρέφει ἐλαφρότερη εὐλαβεία... (Ch; similarly in Š, Mat and Str)
‘Put on, then, compassion, kindness...’

The direct calque ἐλαγκτρέφει for ἑυσπλαγχνία is found only in later texts such as the Sofia Služebnik, a 15th-century copy of the “Liturgy of St. Basil” (Kurz 1958-: I, 108), the “Vita of St. Sava,” and the Zograph Paterikon from the 14th century. (Miklošič 1977: 29).

It must be mentioned here that, while μιλαφρύλωτον and μιλαφρύλωτη can translate the different Greek words ἑυσπλαγχνος, ἔλεος, οἰκτίρμος, and φιλάγαθος, the adjective ἐλαγκτρέφει and its related words render only ἑυσπλαγχνος. This observation leads to an interpretation of the semantic and structural motivation of composita in Church Slavonic. One popular interpretation of the morphemic structure of μιλαφρύλωτη is that it is a Common Slavonic calque of Western origin – Latin or Old High German (Cejtlin 1986: 250). I will not go into details about this opinion, especially as the discussion of the etymology of μιλαφρύλωτη covers only the earliest period of Old Church Slavonic, while I focus on a later time-frame. What is important is whether the two words μιλαφρύλωτη
and ἐλάγχυτροσς were considered synonyms and distinguished on a stylistic or pragmatic basis.

Before I turn to the motivation of the lexical choice in the Slavonic translation of the *Thekara*, I need to touch upon one more detail about the translation principles in later Church Slavonic texts. There is a common opinion among Slavic scholars that the Athonite redaction of the liturgical books aimed at achieving maximal formal equivalence between Church Slavonic and Greek on every level: morphemic, morphosyntactic, and textual. Examples of the formally closer equivalent of ἐὐσπλαγχνος, ἐλάγχυτροσς, are quoted in several works. Maria Jovčeva, in her work on the Slavic translations of the Greek Octoechus, states that ἐὐσπλαγχνος was rendered differently in the Archaic and the Athonite Octoechus: the Archaic translation was μιλοσράδη, as opposed to the calque ἐλάγχυτροσς in the Athonite redaction (Jovčeva 2004: 224). Lora Taseva also points out to ἐλάγχυτροσς as a calque of ἐυσπλαγχνία in the 14th-century Slavic translation of the Synaxarion by Zakxej the Philosopher (Taseva 2000: 205).

If we analyze the Slavonic lexical variation in *Thekara* in these terms (Archaic translation vs. Athonite redaction), we will see that the word in translation β, ἐλάγχυτροσσ, corresponds to the Athonite Octoechus, while the word in translation α in the example 7.2.3.1, ἐλάγχυτροσς, corresponds to the Archaic Octoechus. If we accept this interpretation, then we can argue that translation α leaned, at least in this instance, more toward the traditional lexeme while translation β chose the more innovative one. However, such an
explanation would hold true only for the example in 7.2.3.1 and, to a certain extent, the one in 7.2.3.2 with the lexical variation ἐλαγόστρεφεὶς-ἐλαγόστρεφεὶς. The rest of the examples show agreement between the two Slavonic translations in favor of the innovative vocabulary.

The idea that the Athonite redaction opted for closer formal equivalence would also account to a certain extent for the popularity of ἐλαγόστρεφεὶς in the Slavic translation of the *Thekara*. If we view the morphemic structure of the adjective as still salient for the Slavic translators of the *Thekara* and speculate that they followed the principle of the Athonite redaction for maximal formal equivalence, then their more or less consistent lexical choices of ἐλαγόστρεφεὶς and related words would seem motivated.

In addition, it is possible that ἐλαγόστρεφεὶς was part of high-style imagery, suitable for the monastic audience and thus chosen deliberately to convey the elevated metaphorical meaning of ‘good-hearted.’ Finally, along with the imagery on the level of semantics, the Slavic translation of version α could have decided to use ἰελαμφάλης in 7.2.3.1 for the purposes of alliteration, cf. the sequence ἰε and sonorant [m] in ἰελαμαλέτηνην ἰ ἰεσύμαλτενην ἰ ἰελαμφάλης vs. the lack of such a sequence in version β ἰελαμαλέτηνην ἰ ἰεσύμαλτενην ἰ ἰελαγόστρεφεὶς.

In sum, in their approach to Greek imagery, the Slavic translators of the *Thekara* followed, to a certain extent the tradition of the use of the Slavonic composita μηλαμφάλης and ἐλαγόστρεφεὶς, but in two cases they made different lexical choices by focusing on either the ‘heart’ or the ‘womb’ as the seats for compassion. It is difficult and
irrelevant to look for any semantic motivation for such choice, because we are not aware whether there were any diachronic changes in the preferred lexical root for signifying ‘compassion.’ The only observation we can make in this respect is that in one case, in example 7.2.3.2, version α used the calque (and perhaps hapax legomenon) ηλιόφράιε, which appears to be a mixture of two other composita, ηλαστροφία and ιμαστροφία.

The question whether the translator of α used the roots for ‘heart’ and ‘womb’ indiscriminately is difficult to answer without the availability of a larger lexical corpus and a historical dictionary of Church Slavonic, in particular.

7.2.4. The metaphor of spiritual athleticism, I

I continue now with two examples of semantic extension where one of the Slavic translations demonstrates an interpretation of Greek metaphors.

П идεω γαρ παλαιστάς ήμειν έθετο τας ὀλίγας ταύτας ήμέρας ο κύριος
S ιδεω γαρ παλαιστας έθετο τας ὀλίγας ταύτας ήμέρας ήμειν ο κύριος, 56v (lines 16-18)

‘For the Lord gave us those few days, like a handbreadth in duration’

α σε έσο πεξίνηπο πιστοφέρη πολοχάν γαμή γή μάλια δήνι σίε, 7r (lines 16-17)
β σε έσο κή πεδίνων πολοχάναν εστη λάγ γή μάλια δήνι σίε,17r (lines 2-3)

The puzzle in this example lies in the translation of παλαιστάς in the two Slavic texts. Παλαιστάς is used here in a reminiscence of the Septuagint version of Psalter 39:5 (38:6), where it translates the Hebrew word for ‘handbreadth’ (4 inches).
The form παλαιστάς is the accusative plural of the noun παλαιστή, ‘the palm of the hand, as a measure of length’ (Liddell and Scott 1996: 587). It functions here as accusative of measurement, which agrees syntactically with the accusative phrase τὰς ὀλίγας ταύτας ἡμέρας, ‘those few days.’

In OCS the word used to render Greek παλαιστή is παλά, (‘palm of the hand’). Two occurrences of παλά rendering παλαιστή (‘handbreadth’) and also σπιθαμή (‘span,’ that is ‘a unit of measure, approximately half-cubit or the distance from the thumb to the little finger on an outstretched hand’ (Strong) are cited in Cejtlin’s OCS dictionary (Cejtlin et al., eds. 1994: 561). The dictionary gives παλαιστή as the source word only for παλά; both examples from Isaiah and the Psalter, however, include the past active participle ξυλεφθαλ and the past passive participle ξυλεφθη, respectively:

τίς έμέτρησε τῇ χειρί τὸ ύδωρ, καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν σπιθαμή, Isaiah 40:12

ιδοὺ παλαίστας ἡμῖν ἔδωκεν τὰς ἡμέρας μου, Psalm 39:5 (38:6)

The presence of the participle together with the noun παλά in Psalm 38:6 makes this expression more interpretative than the Hebrew and the Greek ones, perhaps because this particular passage deals with measurement and the Slavic translator wanted to be as clear
and comprehensible as possible. The expression ‘days as handbreadths’ is a metaphor and
the Slavonic text of the Euchologium Sinaicum suggests a literal translation, without
interpretation, just as version α of the Slavonic text of Thekara does. There the translator
of α rendered παλαιστάς descriptively with a participle, which is not present in either
Greek version: πεζάς ημιέρημα. This could have been influenced by Ps. 38:6.

The translator in β, on the other hand, shows an interesting shift in his
interpretation of the Greek text, which seems to have been prompted by his reading of the
feminine Greek word παλαιστή as the masculine παλαιστής, ‘wrestler,’ ‘rival.’ Since
the gender difference does not apply in the plural paradigm in Greek, the translator of β
could have easily confused both words in their plural forms, especially if he did not
associate this passage with that particular psalm. (It is hard to believe that he would not
have known Psalm 38, since the Psalter was recited in its entirety some thirty times in the
course of the Orthodox liturgical year.)

However, there are some problems with this interpretation, which involve the
meaning and uses of the Slavonic word πολάκη. In OCS, the meanings of πολάκη are
‘fight,’ ‘struggle’ ‘battle,’ ‘great deed.’ The word usually renders the Greek ἄγων and
στάδιον; it seems not to have been used as a translation of παλαιστή in other texts.

Thus, we can propose two explanations of the lexical choice in translation β:
1) The translator of β was not aware of the Psalter verse, did not know the Greek word
for ‘handbreadth’ and thus came up with something which made sense in this context; or
else he mechanically confused the word ‘handbreadth’ with the word for ‘wrestler,’ and,
in order to make sense of the latter, came up with the phrase κλ. πολάκη.
2) The translator of β was aware of the Psalter verse but nevertheless decided to use the expression καὶ πολεμικός through the metonymic shift ‘participants’ (wrestlers) – ‘event’ (fight or struggle). Thus, he changed the meaning of the passage and, in so doing, abandoned the allusion to the Psalter in favor of a more ascetic monastic reading of spiritual athleticism.

The concept of spiritual athleticism finds an extensive description in the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians 9:24-27:

Do you not know that in a race all the runners compete, but only one receives the prize? So run that you may obtain it. Every athlete exercises self-control in all things. They do it to receive perishable wreath, but we an imperishable one. For I do not fight aimlessly, I do not box as one beating the air; but I po mmel my body and subdue it, lest after preaching to others I myself should be disqualified.

Spiritual athleticism is, in fact, one of the key concepts in Pauline theology. The comparison that Paul makes between the athletic competition at the classical Greek
games and the development of Christian virtues creates a particular Christian metaphor, that of the spiritual fight. This metaphor is deeply rooted in the Christian concept of defending one’s faith even if that means spiritual and physical struggle. The Slavonic translation of ἀγωνιζόμενος ‘athlete’ (lit., ‘the one who competes’) as πολεμίζων also conceptualizes this metaphor, reflecting both the referential meaning of the Greek word and its Christian experiential dimension, ‘spiritual struggles.’

In sum, the Slavic translator of β seemed also to have resorted to metaphoric imagery, no matter whether he understood παλαιστάς as ‘handbreadth’ or as ‘wrestlers.’ In either case, he departed from the common translation of the metaphor ‘days like handbreadths’ and instead emphasized another image, that of the spiritual athlete.

7.2.5. The metaphor of spiritual athleticism and martyrdom

This example continues the previous discussion on the figurative expression of spiritual athleticism; this time it is in translation α where we find an image drawn on a metonymic relation, but in this case the relation between LOCATION and EVENT.

The Greek word στάδιον conveys the following meanings: ‘a race-course’; ‘an amphitheater’ (ἐν τῷ στάδῳ); ‘a scene of martyrdom or of sufferings preceding
martyrdom’ (Lampe 1968: 1250). The latter meaning apparently developed in the Christian environment on the basis of the metonymic shift LOCATION-EVENT (ACTIVITY), so a sentence such as “The martyr went to the arena today” could be interpreted as ‘a person went to suffer for his Christian faith.’ Below, we will see how the Slavic translator of α handled this metonymic shift.

The literal meaning of στάδιον is present in translation β; παθηματιμε denotes a place for entertainment or, more precisely, ‘a place where people watch something.’ The given word is attested in Supr and in two codices of the Slavonic Apostle – the Karpinski Apostol (13th century) and the Tolstovskij Apostol (14th century). According to Xristova, the original translation σταδια for στάδιον in 1 Cor 9:24 was replaced with παθηματιμε in Preslav, and this is evidence that the Preslav editor had a very good command of the Greek language and Greek cultural realia (Xristova 2004: 640). This explanation of the lexical variation σταδια – παθηματιμε is based on the interpretation of the meaning of ἐν σταδίῳ as the location where the race or competition takes place. In this case, παθηματιμε is indeed a good translation of στάδιον. However, if we consider the whole passage in 1 Cor 9:24, we see that what Paul was referring to was not the place but the competition, i.e., the event. Then, the Preslav lexical choice παθηματιμε would have been either a metonymic shift EVENT-LOCATION or simply a misunderstanding of the Greek text.

Thus, in β, the variant παθηματιμε translates Greek στάδιον with a focus on the location, the arena, and thus succeeds in ‘transferring’ the metaphorical imagery or associations which the Greek had intended.
An analysis of the components of the metaphor $\pi\nu\beta\iota\varsigma\nu\xi$ in $\alpha$ will give us some insight into another possible path of associations. The topic of the metaphor is ‘my conscience is like the arena in Greek or Roman cities.’ The comment is ‘the arena,’ and the associative links are drawn on the functional properties of the arena where various competitions take place and where the competing athletes are fully exposed to the viewers.

Viewed in such way, the topological metaphor of the conscience as an arena is quite lucid. However, given the monastic genre of the text of the Thekara and the constantly present Christian dimension of meaning, it is necessary that we go a step further and look into the parameters of the Christian context of this metaphor. Given the nature of this metaphor and the fact that it represents a complex conceptualization of an event, I will adopt a Fillmorean (frame-semantics) approach in my analysis. The conceptualization of the martyrdom frame in the Christian literature commonly consists of reference to the following elements: the Roman arena, the tortures, the torturers, and the Christian martyrs. In Fillmore’s terms, all the elements in an underlying conceptual scene refer to our own experience and perception of the world, as well as our memory of them (Fillmore and Atkins 1992: 76-77). The experience, the perception or the memory is shared and this ensures our ability to understand and use language as well as the ability to translate.

The conceptual frame of martyrdom was familiar to the Slavs, though they would not have been fully aware of all characteristics of a classical Greek *topos* such as $\sigma\tau\alpha\delta\nu\upsilon$. However, the Slavonic translation of many Lives of early Christian martyrs – in *Supr*, for example – reveals that the Slavs understood and translated the Greek terms for
different places where martyrs were tortured and eventually killed. These terms were most often ῆ́μα, translated with θελήματε (‘court’ both in the meaning of ‘open space’ and ‘room’) and στάδιον, translated with χελήματε. In translating these terms, the Slavs usually rendered the referential meaning, pointing to the location of the martyrdom. However, I was able to find one text, the Encomion to the forty martyrs, where στάδιον is translated as καὶ πολέμησά – i.e., not referentially but metonymically:

Clearly, here the Slavic translators knew what στάδιον referred to; part of this knowledge was probably based on the presence of the participants in this scene, the forty martyrs. Thus, the translator chose to emphasize the great deed of martyrdom and sacrifice for the Christian faith instead of just giving a toponymic reference to the place of this martyrdom, the arena.

If we go back to the text of the Thekara in translation α and apply our analysis of the martyrdom conceptual frame, we will see that the expression καὶ πολέμησά ‘fits’ this frame in a way similar to the above-quoted example from Supr. The phrase καὶ πολέμησά could mean ‘in suffering’ or ‘in a great deed,’ which are both elements of martyrdom; the

---

68 There are, of course, other places where the Christian martyrs faced their torturers, such as prison, rivers, the sea, bridges, etc., but they are not an object of discussion here.
translation of the whole passage in version α then reads: “Woe is me, Lord, that in the martyrdom of my conscience, in place of a public accuser I always denounce myself as unworthy.” This draws on the metonymic shift LOCATION-EVENT, described above in the framework of Christian topology, in which slaying Christian martyrs was closely associated with the arena in early Christian times, and hence, in Slavonic translations of early Christian and patristic texts.

The semantic representation of the words πολεμεῖ, πᾶλαι, and πολεμῶμεν as they appear in CS texts and in the Thekara is given in Figure 7.2. The dotted line between παλαιστή and παλαιστής represents the unexpected but possible connection between both words on the part of the Slavic translator of α.
Figure 7.2: Semantic representation of ‘martyrdom’
As Figure 7.2 indicates, the Slavonic word πολλήδες covers a large area of semantic elements found in the meaning of different Greek words, referring to a range of things – from ‘location’ to ‘event.’ The same is true of θέστρον, where this metonymic shift is also present in the meaning of the Greek word. What is interesting in this lexical variation is that each translation is not consistent in its word choice but makes use of the contextual and metalinguistic (monastic) connotations of the word πολλήδες. This shows the creativity and the analytical approach of the Slavic translators, who did not always use the same formal and semantic equivalents of Greek words (cf. Rosén 1997: 156; MacRobert 1993: 263).

Before I continue with the next example of Greek imagery, I would like to discuss the lexical variation in regard to one more element included in the martyrdom frame: the figure of the torturer. This is in 7.2.5 again, but this time the word in focus is δημίου.

S Ο力还是 κύριε ὅτι ἐν τῷ σταδίῳ τῆς συνειδήσεως μου, ἀνεύ τινος δημίου ἐμαυτὸν ἂεὶ ἀποδοκιμαζώ, 55τ (lines 6-8)
‘Woe’s me, Lord, that in the arena of my conscience, in place of a public accuser I always denounce myself as unworthy’
α σύκα λέγε ἵνα ἰκά νὰ ποίηση σκαβετη μοιε κρωμέ ἵνκενο ἥκτευο μέσα σὲ δήμιο σφαίρις, 5v (lines 18-20)
β σύκα λέγε ἵνα ἰκά νὰ ποζορισθη σκαβετη μοιε κρωμέ δολιγόνα ἥκτενο σὲ δήμιο ἱεροῦ, 15v (lines 15-16)

The word δημίου is not a common word in Greek. In Classical Greek, it denotes ‘public executioner’ but it can also mean ‘belonging to the people’ (Liddell and Scott 1996: 386). In patristic literature, the noun δημίος is apparently not attested, though the related verb δεμένω is attested in the meaning ‘to make public,’ ‘to admonish publicly,’
‘to punish by fee’ (Lampe 1968). This is not a word commonly used in reference to a martyrdom scene, but it bears the elements of ‘public admonishment’ and ‘punishment’ in its semantics, which makes it a good candidate for such a scene. The Slavonic translation here shows a lexical variation that could be explained by the translators’ focus on one or the other element of the semantics of the Greek word.

Slavonic МКУНТЕЉ (‘torturer’) is a quite common word, which translates different Greek lexemes: τύραννος, παράνομος, βασανιστής, and ἡγέμων with their different connotations in various contexts, including the semantic extension of a ‘ruler’ as a ‘torturer’:

In this example from the Life of three early Christian martyrs, the designation of the ruler in the second sentence is “torturer” in the Slavonic translation, despite the use of one and the same Greek word ἡγέμων in both cases. This shows that the Slavic translator interpreted the meaning of the Greek word in accordance with the meaning of the whole passage; namely, the three martyrs are taken to be not only examined but also tortured on the path to their martyrdom. Data from other lives and encomia of Christian saints

69 However, I have not found any instance of МКУНТЕЉ rendering δημιός in the extant OCS or CS texts.
indicate the traditional presence of a ‘torturer’ or ‘interrogator’ as a common element in scenes of interrogations leading to the murder of the saints.

The word in version β, ὄειλανηλῆ, usually translates Greek ἐλεγγέος (‘cross-examiner’), as in Psalm 72:14, or ἀποτηγορος (‘accuser’), as in the Slavonic translation of the “13th Homilies of Gregory the Great” in a 11th-century copy (Sreznevskij 1971: II, 524).

Clearly, both ἰέλεγέος and ὄειλανηλῆ have points of semantic similarity, but they are not synonyms by any means. The particular context of example 7.2.5 in the *Thekara* will help us interpret this lexical choice.

I suggest that we analyze this Slavonic variation in reference to the concepts of suffering and denouncing as part of the martyrdom conceptual frame. Both words point to one referent: ‘the person who examines, interrogates, or even tortures.’ In the case of ὄειλανηλῆ, given the Greek words that it usually translates and the contexts where it occurs, we might say that the focus of its semantics is on the verbal part of the examination, with no reference to tortures whatsoever. It is important to note that cross-examiners did sometimes engage in physical torturing, but it is hard to determine whether this is relevant here without reference to the real-world situation. On the other hand, ἰέλεγέος not only implies but in certain contexts directly refers to a person who performs the actual torturing.

Thus, by making different lexical choices here, the Slavic translators of the *Thekara* demonstrate once again their evaluative approach to the Greek by focusing on particular aspects of the referential semantics of δημίος. Their translation in this
particular example is based not only on semantic clues, but also on encyclopedic knowledge of the figure of  δημίους and its relevance for setting the context.

If we refer to the analysis of the martyrdom metaphor and spiritual athleticism in example 7.2.5, we will see that the choice of  μακρυτέλη in version α strengthens our argument that the translator offered a more spiritual (ascetic) interpretation of this passage.

7.2.6. The hardening of heart metaphor

S λύσον χύρε την πόρωσιν τής ὀλισθηράς μου καρδίας, 52v (lines 10-11)
“Destroy, Lord, the hardening/darkening of my slippery heart”

α ραζορή ἐν οἰκληθεθείᾳ πολλακτηθεθείᾳ μη όμη, 3v (lines 14-15)
β ραζορία τήν οἰκληθεθείᾳ πολλακτηθεθείᾳ μη όμη, 14r (lines 1-2)

The passage in example 7.2.6 exemplifies how the two Slavic editors took different paths to ‘arrive’ at the metaphorical designation of mental/spiritual hardness. The Greek word πόρωσις means ‘hardening,’ ‘mental and spiritual callousness’ (Lampe 1968: 1214). The word appears three times in the NT, with the following literary and figurative meanings: “1) The covering with a callus; 2) Obtrusiveness of mental discernment, dulled perception; 3) The mind of one has been blunted” (Strong).

In the Gospel of Mark 3:5, πόρωσις was used in the metaphorical meaning of ‘hardening of heart’:

συλλυπούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ πωρώσει τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, Mark 3:5
σύλλυπα ο οἰκληθεθείᾳ χρυσά υπέ (M; similarly in Z and A)
‘Grieved at their hardness of hearts’
The given example shows that the OCS Gospels used the word ὀκαλυπθηκεῖ to translate πόρφυς, just like version α of the Thekara.⁷₀

The same metaphor occurs in Eph 4:18, where it is the result of the ‘darkening’ of the mind:

ἔσκοπωμένου τῇ διανοίᾳ ὅντος, ἀπηλλοτριωμένου τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τῆς ἄγνοιας τῆς οὕτων ἐν αὐτοῖς, διὰ τῆς πόρφυρας τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν
Ποιμανθήνη μικρὰ σοφία, συγνόκοπη τῇ γνώσει εἰκόνα, ἵνα ἐνστρεφθῇ σοφία εἰς κοινήν, ἵνα ὀκαλυπθῇ διαφόροι

‘They are darkened in their understanding, alienated from the life of God because of the ignorance that is in them, due to their hardness of heart’

The third instance of πόρφυς in the New Testament is in Romans 11:25:

ἐὰν μὴ ἦτε παρ’ ἑαυτοῖς φρόνιμοι, ὅτι πόρφυς ἀπὸ μέρους τῷ Ἰσραήλ γέγονεν ἀχρίς οὐ τὸ πλῆρωμα τῶν ἑθνῶν εἰσέλθῃ

‘Lest you be wise in your own conceits, I want you to understand this mystery, brethren: a hardening has come upon part of Israel, until the full number of the Gentiles come in.’

The figurative meaning of πόρφυς must have been one of the factors for the lexical variation in the Slavonic translation in Eph 4:18 and Romans 11:25 in the text of the Apostle. Xristova offers an interesting case of lexical variation between ὀκαλυπθηκεῖ and ἐνστρεφθῇ, a variation that clearly took the direction of rendering the Greek

---

⁷₀This does not by any means imply knowledge of this particular Gospel verse on the part of the translator of version α. He could have translated πόρφυς with ὀκαλυπθηκεῖ completely independently.
metaphor πώρωσιν τῆς καρδίας, unlike the one in the Slavonic translation of the 

_Thekara._

According to Xristova, the word πώρωσις in Eph 4:18 yields a lexical variation between the Archaic (Ohrid) translation of the Apostle, where we find окаменелие, and the 14th-century Athonite redaction, which has the variant нерешеннé (‘indifference’). Xristova states that it is difficult to determine which translation is better, and she resorts to the modern Bulgarian expression of the ‘hardening of the heart’ metaphor: безчувствие на сърцата (literary, ‘lack of feelings of the hearts’) and коравосърдечие на сърцата (a semi-tautology, literary ‘hard-heartedness of the hearts’). The same word πώρωσις in Romans 11:25 was rendered with окаменелие in the Archaic translation but with нерешеннé (‘bafflement’) in the Athonite redaction. Xristova argues that in Romans 11:25, the Apostle Paul may have implied that some of the Jews did not understand (нерешеннé ὑπ’ ἣν αὐτῷ Η persone οὐκέτι) and denied the coming of Jesus Christ the Messiah. She thinks that if we accept such interpretation, the Athonite word нерешеннé appears to be more precise and clear. She concludes that in both passages, Eph 4:18 and Romans 11:25, the Athonite redaction renders one and the same Greek word with different Slavic words, a fact that contradicts the opinion of some scholars that the Athonite redaction followed a word-for-word translation procedure without taking the context into account (Xristova 2004: 553).

The word окаменелие appears as a lexical doublet to окаменелие only here, in the 

_Thekara._ Its choice was probably prompted by the context and the topic of the metaphor,
The interpretation of the semantics of the metaphoric associations points to a designation of the mental and spiritual state of a person, devoid of passions or feelings. The basic meaning of ὀμμανή is ‘darkness’ when it translates the Greek σκότωσις, which can also extend metaphorically to ‘darkness of the soul’ or ‘darkness of the mind’ (‘darkness,’ ‘gloom’). Consider the following examples from Avanesov (1988- : VI, 125):

1. οὐρανὴ τὰκούν ὃμμανήν ἄσπερον καὶ τὰγετὴς τελευτῶν (Chronicle of Amartolos) ‘To see the sorrow and the spiritual darkness and the bodily afflictions’

2. ἰδικὸ εὐσκεκτα ἂτο ὅμμανῆν πομίκαλ σκοῖς (Theodore the Studite’s Spiritual Instructions) ‘Like without light and with darkening of his thoughts’

3. ὀμμανὴν χεραγημένα ἔχειν φυλή (Theodore the Studite’s Spiritual Instructions) ‘They darkened their foolish hearts’

The juxtaposition of ὀμμανή with πομίκαλ in example 2 shows the equivalent of the Greek concept of ‘darkness’ denoting both physical darkness and the darkness of one’s mind (‘person who does not think clearly’). The ‘darkness’ of the cognitive ability and the ‘hardness’ of emotions are also juxtaposed in Eph 4:18: ἐσχοτωμένοι τῆς διανοίας, ὀμμανῆν μέκαλα (‘darkened in their understanding’) and πόρωσιν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, ἐκκαμμένης φυλῆ νῆσα (‘their hardening of heart’).

71 Cf. the modern English metaphor hardhearted, which signifies personal characteristics related to emotions; a hardhearted person is devoid of feelings for others.
In example 3, however, the ‘darkness’ is not cognitive but emotional, a metaphor similar to the one in version β, ομαχείοι πολιτικοϑαλήνης μη μή. In this example, just as in the Thekara, the darkness is not cognitive but emotional, referring to ‘emptiness,’ ‘coldness.’ What is the path of associations necessary to arrive at such metaphor?

The starting point is that the vision is physically obstructed by something, and this obstruction can lead to physical blindness. This image is then set against a conceptualization of emotional states – in which one’s senses are dulled, i.e., not clear. Such a path suggests a translators’ focus on the perceptual dimensions of meaning, related to the sense of vision.

In sum, the word ομαχείοι in version α translated faithfully the Greek metaphoric imagery of ‘hardening’ by focusing on the associations with a hard substance, evoked by the image of ‘stone.’ Version β, on the other hand, emphasized a different aspect of the perceptual associations, the aspect of visual obstruction. Both metaphors, however, used the perceptual dimension of meaning, each utilizing it in a different way in order to signify the state of total destitution, lack of emotions, and dulling of the senses.
CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSIONS

In this last chapter, I will discuss the results of the analysis of the Slavonic lexical variation in the *Thekara* and outline the main contributions of the study.

The two main questions related to understanding of lexical variation that I raised in Chapter 1 were why and how the lexical variation was possible. The first question pertained to the motivation of different lexical choices in the Slavonic translation, the second to the mechanisms of translation. My goal in this last chapter is to answer these questions and provide more general observations on the lexical semantics in translation praxis.

On a methodological level, my analysis of the lexical variation in the two versions of the Slavonic *Thekara* showed that, in translation studies, it is necessary to account for the full range of possible factors (linguistic and extralinguistic) of the lexical choice in order to understand the mechanisms of translation and editorial work. At the same time, some of the cases I analyzed clearly showed that it is virtually impossible to describe fully the semantic motivation of the translator/editor’s choice due to the insufficient context or to contextual ambiguity. The fact that we are dealing with two premodern
languages, Byzantine Greek and Church Slavonic, also contributes to difficulties in the semantic analysis.

Despite these problems, my study showed that there are numerous factors that gave rise to lexical variation in the Slavonic Thekara. The most salient linguistic factors appear to be polysemy, contextual ambiguity, imagery, avoidance of semantic redundancy, and an attempt to preserve the rhetorical structure of the Greek sentence. However, the motivation for the variation in the case of lexical doublets proved to be more difficult to capture. Most of the lexical doublets discussed in Chapter 4 were near-synonyms – evidence of the referential competence of the Slavic translators. Most of the lexical choices in the case of doublets did not differ in their reference; άφωνον - άφωνον in 4.2.2, for example, refer to the same individual but there is a nuance of ‘distribution’ in the case of άφωνον. Rather, the doublets differed in their focus (evaluative or perceptual) on certain aspects of their semantics. This focus is additional to the mere referential level of meaning and more likely pertains to inferential competence.⁷²

The referential identity of the lexical doublets apparently made them fully substitutable in different contexts, i.e., seeming synonyms. However, we distinguished several mechanisms for producing synonyms: intensity of emotions, ‘whole-part’ relations, moral evaluation, etc. In the cases of the abstract words for emotions (e.g., ‘fear’), we linked the prototypical concept of the particular emotion to its expression in several contexts, which gave us a range of possible nuances in the meaning of emotion

---

⁷² The referential and inferential competences were discussed in Chapter 2 as a part of Violi’s non-unified model of semantics.
words. The solution to such cases was to analyze all the known collocations of emotion words; often the modifiers or verbs accompanying the emotion words provided clues to understanding their prototypes and individual contextual meanings.

There were a few interesting cases of referential ambiguity, such as the variation ἁθυτηταὶ and ὁμονωμηκέ. We showed in Chapter 7 that these two words are not synonyms outside of the specific context of the Thekara. They point to different real-world referents, which happened to be compatible within the semantic frame of ‘martyrdom.’ In this case, it was the contextual modulation of the basic meanings of these words that provided clues for understanding the intended referents of ἁθυτηταὶ and ὁμονωμηκέ.73 We also noted the role of contextual selection in cases of polysemy, as in the translation of Greek μετεωριζομαι, where the meaning ‘to be arrogant’ was selected by the particular context of use.

In other cases, the ambiguity of the context was responsible for lexical variation, as it was shown in Chapter 5. There we had to resort to other interpretations to gain insight to the motivation and mechanisms of lexical variation. The analysis of ἱππαλκη and ὃθη and the related verbs demonstrated the explanatory value of semantic roles of ‘agent’ and ‘experiencer.’ The orientation of an act such as ‘injustice’ or ‘insult’ towards the person who inflicts it or the person who suffers (from) it was evidence for the specific evaluative features (pathemic) not only of linguistic but also of translation competence.

73 The concept of ‘contextual modulation’, proposed by Cruse (1989: 52), describes the modification of certain sense by different contexts – emphasis or suppression of certain semantic traits.
Such translation competence is manifested in cases of lexical variation that were not found anywhere else but in the translation of the *Thekara*: ơрњици âîмъ юнять, ымътиâ – ﬂуоûåò, ымътици са – ыафъици са, иуенъи – иредъиунати, иырастье – ыогъыргъыкъ, etc. Even in cases where the lexical variation in the *Thekara* was found in other CS texts, we cannot assume that the motivation for such variation is the same, since the contexts are different. This the reason why I proposed to avoid mere listings of lexical pairs or doublets (Oxrid-Preslav or Oxrid-Athos), because every single context of occurrence of the lexical item could be different.\(^\text{74}\)

The most prominent extralinguistic factor for lexical variation in the *Thekara* pertained to the monastic genre and orientation of the text, which prompted the use of certain formulae such as ‘eternal punishment.’ Some of these formulae are clearly based on intertextual connections within the net of texts from the Christian corpus. This situation is typical for medieval translations, as shown in other studies of Biblical translations. The Christian dimension of meaning was also discussed as one of the factors behind the translations of Greek metaphors, such as the metaphor of ‘spiritual athleticism.’ Unlike the case of probably language-universal metaphors related to emotions, moral evaluation, and body parts, the metaphor of ‘spiritual athleticism’ should be interpreted as a specific socio-cultural phenomenon, born from the symbiosis between the Classical Antiquity and the subsequent Christian period.

\(^\text{74}\) Clear exceptions are the books of the Old and the New Testament, where we deal with the same context in different manuscripts (if there is not textual variation within the manuscripts).
Another extralinguistic factor was the use of two Greek texts by the Slavic translators of α and β – a situation that was common in medieval translations. Certainly, the difficulty of gaining access to manuscripts and the lack of critical editions of the Greek text impede a complete study of the Greek manuscript tradition of the Thekara. Nonetheless, despite these limitations, I was able to show that certain cases of lexical variation are simply the result of the using two different Greek copies. Future textological work on a more extensive basis will reveal the dynamic of the Greek tradition of the text and possibly uncover more cases of Greek variation that is reflected in Slavonic lexical choices.

Most of these factors have been already discussed in the translation literature, but mostly with respect to modern translations. Nida is the only scholar thus far who has managed to systematize all these factors in his works, mostly from his own experience in translating the Bible into Modern English.75 My study differs from the works of Nida and other biblical scholars in the scope of the analyzed data from two ancient languages: Byzantine Greek and Church Slavonic. Methodologically, an interpretation of the factors and mechanisms of translation from premodern to a modern language is different from an interpretation of these factors and mechanisms in translation from one premodern language to another, if only because there are no native speakers, and hence no knowledge of particular communicative situations and the appropriateness of the translations.

75 Recall his analysis of the appropriateness of the English translation of βίος with ‘living’ and ‘estate’ in Chapter 2.
My analysis of the mechanisms of lexical variation in the Slavonic translation of the *Thekara* gave interesting insights into the way translators approached the Greek text and handled the difficulties caused by polysemy, figurative meaning, contextual idiosyncrasies, etc. Several major tendencies can be noted in the Slavic translations:

1. Both translators/editors did not work on the lexical level alone; they looked at the whole sentence and, in many cases, the whole paragraph in order to determine the contextual meaning of the Greek word.

2. They did not just replace separate words; they thought of the best translation equivalent with a view to the larger context, the general semantics of the Greek and the Slavic words, the cultural realia designated by the lexical units, and their own understanding of the spirituality of monastic discourse. In other words, the Slavic translators did not just have an editorial ‘hit list,’ the existence of which might be suggested by the way some scholars approach lexical variants in Slavic translations. Positing such a list, with preferred and dispreferred words, is a rather mechanical way to approach the extremely intellectual and vigorous work on the part of the Slavic translators and editors.

These general tendencies in the praxis of the Slavic translators can be further explicated by concrete instances of the translation strategies that yielded lexical variation. In their work, the translators of α and β made use of

- derivation to emphasize certain semantic features;
- structural and semantic calques in order to achieve formal equivalence to the Greek vocabulary;
• skewing between grammar and semantics to focus on semantic differences (‘sing’ vs. ‘praise’) or similarities (the active and middle semantics of the verbs for ‘suffer’);
• rhetorical devices such as antithesis (‘long patience’ vs. ‘abruptness’);
• pragmatic inferences (implicatures) to avoid redundancy;
• metonymic and metaphorical extensions to highlight different associative relations (‘location’ and ‘event’; the natural action ‘to smell’ and the existence of a smell);
• knowledge of cognitive processes and acts to foreground a specific aspect of the conceptualization of the world (‘prefer’ vs. ‘choose’).

It is clear the lexical variation in the Slavonic translation of the *Thekara* in its greater part is based on foregrounding mechanisms, i.e., the bringing into focus of specific semantic features, metaphorical associations and socio-cultural concepts. Such foregrounding cannot be analyzed solely on the referential level of semantics but must include reference to the perceptual and axiological (evaluative) dimensions of meaning. We can suggest that such foregrounding is a part of any translation work in any epoch. Thus, we can view the field of translation as worthy of research in the field of lexical semantics, and especially, research within functional and cognitive frameworks.

In conclusion, I will highlight the contributions of this study to the fields of philology, lexical semantics, and translation studies. The present study introduced a previously little-known text to the field of manuscript studies. A substantial part of the Greek manuscripts of the text of the *Thekara* was reviewed, parsed, and collated. All the extant Slavonic copies of the translation of this text were located and investigated. Some preliminary textological work on the relations within the Greek and the Slavonic
manuscript families was done for the purposes of semantic analysis. However, a more in-depth analysis is needed for a complete picture of the textual relations among the different manuscripts.

The main object of this study, the lexical variation in the Slavonic translation of the *Thekara*, was approached inductively, as a manifestation of the heterogenous nature of the semantic organization of the lexicon. Thus, approaches from different theoretical frameworks were used to interpret the data – componential analysis, the concept of lexical fields, the methods of frame-semantics, Gricean inferential analysis, and the cognitive linguistics approach to imagery. The analysis of the data in these terms provided a model of best practices for approaching lexical semantics in medieval translations. Such a methodology is based on various interpretative strategies that were able to capture the nature of the semantic relations between the source and target words, as well as the mechanisms of semantic transfer.

The classification of lexical variation in this study was done on the basis of the factors for this variation and the mechanisms of producing lexical variation. The factors which contributed to this variation were different Greek copies of the text, polysemy of the source word, contextual ambiguity in the source text, and the complexity of imagery in the source text. I made extensive reference to inferential associations in the case of derivational and lexical doublets in order to highlight different semantic properties or features of the referent from the source text. In this regard, traditional philological views on lexical doublets were reconsidered in favor of detailed analysis of the semantic motivation behind every single case of lexical doublets. Cases of reinterpretation of the
Greek word were discussed separately, with reference both to the triggers and the mechanisms of such reinterpretation.

The semantic analysis of the data was done in context; thus, lexical units were observed in their uses, and not as ideal constructs of semantic features. Furthermore, the meaning and use of the Greek and Slavonic words were interpreted diachronically, as part of the language systems. Therefore, the lexical variation in the *Thekara* was juxtaposed with lexical variations in other CS texts to ensure a common ground for the analysis and to focus on the idiosyncracies in the translation of the *Thekara*.

The idiosyncracies in the translation mechanisms and strategies in the *Thekara*, together with the nature of the lexical variation, are the basis for my preliminary conclusions about the way the Greek text was translated. At this stage of my research, one probable scenario for the Slavonic translation emerges: there was originally a single Slavonic translation of the Greek text; then, later on, one or two redactions of this initial translation occurred, both evidently on the basis of fresh comparison to different Greek manuscripts. This scenario can only be verified after we account for all morphosyntactic features of the Slavonic translation in relation to the Greek text.

It is likely that the original translation was done in the 14th century. The basis for such a supposition is that the 14th century was an epoch of intense translation activity not only on Mount Athos but also in Trnovo and its surrounding monasteries in present-day Bulgaria, Dečani monastery in present-day Serbia, and other large monastic centers. The content of the *Thekara* (special hymns dedicated to the triadic nature of God) and its theological and philosophical orientation provides further support for this hypothesis, since the 14th-century Hesychast movement, which was influential on Mount Athos, was
based on the theology of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite and Symeon the New Theologian, among others. The specific monastic ascetism that was practiced by the Hesychasts could also be viewed as a reason for choosing this particular monastic compilations of devotional texts for translation into Slavonic.

Surely, there are no better final words on the topic of words than Edda Weigand’s conclusion that we can no longer leave semantics to intuition (1998: 64). My study of the lexical variation in Slavonic translations proved that intuition and mere description are indeed not enough to capture the complex semantic relations between words. What we need is an elaborative methodology that will account both for the motivation and the mechanisms of lexical variation in translations.
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APPENDIX A

LEXICON
GREEK-SLAVONIC-ENGLISH LEXICON OF THE MIDNIGHT OFFICE OF
THE THEKARA

ἀγαλλίασιν, ἐχαθοριῆ, ἐκεῖλε joy

ἀγων, ὑδαί, πράκλεν lead, rule

ἀδεῶς, ἐκ στραγ, ἐκελέζημε rê freely, without restrain

ἀδιαφορία, νερακειανεῖς προχαλάζημε indifference

ἀδικίαν, ἡμπλῆς ἐβιοτανγ ἀδικίαν, ἐκείνη ὁδικία injustice, unrighteousness, wrongdoing

ἀθανάτων, ἐκεύρυτῆς, ἐκείνη immortal, everlasting

ἀθέσμως, ἐγκάργα, ἐκείνη lawless, wicked

ἀθέσμων, ἐγκράτης, ἐκείνη lawless, wicked

ἀθλία, εἴναλα, ἐκείνα unhappy, miserable, suffering

αἰσχροῖς, σκψγνη, ἔλα, filthy

αἰσχύνης, στελα, φράμ shame

ἀμελεῖών, ἐταεδής, ἐκειές εμέληνε indifference

ἀκολασίαν, σκψγνη, ἐκείνης, εκείνη lawlessness, intemperance

ἀμερίμνω, ἐπεκεῖ ἐκ, ἐκείνης ἀμέρίμνω to be care-free

ἀναβρασμένης, γράμμω, κλωκωμΐς burning

ἀναίτιος, ἐπεκεῖνης, ἐκείτηνος not being the cause or reason, self-existent


\(\text{\`ane\`ixastov, neiz\`evene, neiskazhenn beyond conjecture or comparison}\)

\(\text{\`ane\`ixastov, neiz\`evene, e\`em\`evene unspeakable}\)

\(\text{\`an\`xoi\`ai, p`esk\`a\`wa\`ne, nep\`esk\`a\`wan\`e\`w not listening}\)

\(\text{\`an\`th\`ai\`ro\`um\`e\`no, p`e\`p\`o\`n\`t\`a\`m, n\`e\`e\`m\`a\`m choose, prefer}\)

\(\text{\`an\`o\`n\`e\`ta, e\`e\`z e\`y\`e\`h\`a, ne\`e\`m\`a\`n\`e unprofitable; in vain}\)

\(\text{\`ant\`i\`lo\`i\`a\`n, p`e\`r\`e\`k\`a\`m\`e, p`e\`r\`ek\`o\`l\`e\`e dispute; offence; contradiction}\)

\(\text{\`an\`u\`p\`o\`s\`t\`a\`t\`o, nep\`esk\`a\`t\`a\`n\`e, nep\`e\`l\`e\`r\`e\`p\`l\`e\`n\`e that cannot be withstood or endured}\)

\(\text{\`ap\`a\`w\`s\`t\`o, nep\`esk\`a\`t\`a\`n\`e, b`e\`p\`e\`r\`e\`l\`e\`n\`e unceasing}\)

\(\text{\`ap\`e\`r\`i\`o\`r\`i\`s\`t\`o, nep\`i\`k\`a\`n\`a, nep\`e\`p\`e\`d\`e\`l\`a\`n\`a unlimited, infinite, indescribable}\)

\(\text{\`ap\`o\`b\`r\`e\`f\`o\`u\`s, w`\`a\`m\`e\`t\`a, w`\`a\`d\`e\`t\`e\`s\`t\`r\`a from childhood}\)

\(\text{\`ap\`o\`d\`o\`k\`m\`a\`\`z\`o\`w, n\`u\`n\`u\`n\`k\`a\`d\`e, nep\`e\`r\`e\`g\`e\`y c\`e reject (myself) as unworthy or unfit}\)

\(\text{\`ap\`o\`z\`o\`u\`s\`a\`i\`c, s\`e\`r\`\`w\`a\`l\`e\`m\`i, s\`e\`r\`\`w\`a\`l\`e\`m\`i stinking}\)

\(\text{\`a\`p\`o\`r\`i\`a, n\`e\`j\`e\`t\`e, x\`a\`d\`e\`s\`t\`i poverty}\)

\(\text{\`a\`p\`o\`t\`o\`m\`i\`a, n\`e\`p\`e\`m\`e\`d\`e\`m\`i, w\`s\`e\`b\`e\`n\`e\`i abruptness, hastiness; severity}\)

\(\text{\`a\`p\`o\`f\`a\`s\`a\`n, n\`e\`\`e\`g\`e, n\`e\`\`e\`g\`e\`i negation, judgment, statement, sentence, decision}\)

\(\text{\`a\`p\`l\`a\`g\`\`h\`\`u\`o\`i, n\`e\`m\`e\`l\`a\`n, n\`e\`l\`a\`g\`o\`\`w\`\`r\`e\`m\`i\`i merciless}\)

\(\text{\`a\`s\`\`u\`g\`\`n\`\`w\`\`a\`s\`t\`a, v\`a\`y\`e\`w\`e\`\`e\`n\`i\`h, n\`e\`m\`a\`t\`e\`\`w in\`e\`x\`o\`r\`a\`b\`l\`y, r\`e\`l\`e\`n\`t\`e\`l\`y}\)

\(\text{\`a\`s\`\`u\`g\`\`h\`\`\`r\`e\`f\`i\`t\`a, v\`a\`y\`e\`w\`e\`\`e\`n\`i\`h, e\`e\`z p\`r\`e\`e\`w\`e\`l\`a without forgiveness, without pardon}\)

\(\text{\`a\`s\`\`u\`k\`\`r\`e\`t\`a, n\`e\`m\`e\`s\`u\`t\`e\`n, e\`e\`z r\`a\`\`w\`e\`\`e\`n\`i\`h incomparably, much more, greatly}\)
σφάλεια, οὐτεργήθησεν, κρεποστε stability, steadfastness

ἀτρεπτος, οὐπετελος, οὐπερφατα immortal, unchangeable

ἄχρειομεθα, οὐκαμάνην ἐσθιε, οὐ ῥαθι render useless, disable, damage

ἀφατος, οὐγιάλινα, οὐποδοσιμα unspeakable

βασανίζεται, στρακετ, μιυη suffer, torture

βασανισμος, στραμε, μογγειε suffering, torture

βεβοροφορομενον, ἐσθηρηνωςαγο σε, ὑκληηην muddied, defiled

γυμνον, ηλαγο, οεναηηηη naked, stripped

δαπανησας, ημιηρη, ημιην spend; consume, use up; exhaust it

ὑπο δικην, ποδι ικτιν, ποδι σογεδ under punishment

ὑπο της δικης, πραξελεω σογεδ justly

δημιου, ἦτης, οελουηηηνa public executioner, cross-examiner

δεσποζουσα, οελαπιεε, κλαδειηε be lord or master of; rule over

διεπραξαμην, στηρη, σαδηεδ pass over; bring about, accomplish

δοτηρ, δατεω, πολατεω giver, dispenser

ἐθεασάγην, εθηδε, ογρηεε see, watch

ἐκτεταμενη, πρεστηηηηη, πριετηηηη stretched out; expanded

ἐμπαθη, πριετηη, στηηη suffering
ένεπλαθής, ἰσπασίν γε, ἱερεύς γε fill up, supply
έντευθεν, ζδε, ὅπειρο here
ήδη, οὔκε, ποιε still
ήττώμεθα, πεπεζδαμεν γε, κύνηγαν όχθα, ἐκάλε γε to be defeated, to yield
ζωής, ζωή, ζωή life
θαρρῶν, ἀνάβε γε, ἀφαίνε to have confidence, to be bold
θελήμασιν, χωτενίων, καλὴν faculty of will; act of willing
θρηνήσεις καταπλαγείς γε, καταραδασιν, wail, cry, weep
θρίβυνον, πλαγιο, ρυγαδιε weep, cry
θυσιαστηρίῳ, αὐτῷ, κρυπτώνικαν altar
ιδρυσις, οἰκοβάσις, συμπεζδαμέ ὑπο establishment, foundation
ιλάσθητι, συκεθε, συμπεζδαμένει be merciful, gracious
ήττώμεθα, πεπεζδαμεν γε, κύνηγαν όχθα, ἐκάλε γε to be defeated (pass.), to yield
ήχρείωσα, ἑκκαυγύ ςαζεκας, ἑποτερεβενς ςαζεκας to render useless or worthless
καταλαλιάν, κλέβεται, ἐγκαλή detraction, back-biting, slander
καρδία, γρε, λίθε heart
καταδαπαγών, ἔκςαρκε, ἔκσωκα, squander
κατανοοῦσα, συμβαθείς, ποιησιμαθείς, contemplate
κατάφρονησιν, ἄνεβον, ἄνεδειον indifference, carelessness

καταφρονταῖς, ἄνεβοντε, ἄσφεστον contemper, despiser

κατέλθης, εἰλικρ., προῖο go or come down, decline, fall; come to a place

κατήγοροι, κλεβώνια, Βυζάντιον back-bitters

κατηφῆς, ψυχλός, δρέλλ sorrowful; distressed

χαυθμόν, πᾶ , ρύδινιν weeping

χρατῶν, δργεῖ, σταδίσσει rule, rule over

χυβέρνησον, σκφλν, παράδεικν guide

λύσον, ραζον, ράθϊνιν loose, release

μεθοδίαν σατανικήν, νακετοπατέ τανθίκο, κηρύσσαν κατανθίκον craft, cunning devices

μετέωρον, ψιθυριςμοι, γλυκιστήρα raised from the ground; puffed up, arrogant

μετεώριζομαι, εγκυμοσύνης to be arrogant

μεσείθαι, γνώσθη, ἐνεχαστι hate; grudge

μόνην, τόμε, η σαμα alone, only; once

μόνην, τόμε, τό σαμα one and only

όδυνηρός, προκρίς, κολεξίης painful, distressing

όλεθριον, παγεμέω τάμ evil

όλικως, Εκθεσκτς, κάκα altogether, completely, fully; in general
όρω, ἴδε, ζητεῖ see, watch

δι', ζητεῖ, ἵκε because

οὐσίοποιοῦν, ὁσμηνιστεῖς, οσμήκο τερεῖ create

οὕτως, τακε, οὕτω this way

οὐαί μου, γοή μην, ὦβας μην woe is me

παλαιστάς, ποιόν ἰματεμένης, καὶ ποιήσω measured by handbreadth

παρεπίκρατα, ὄργην, προνεβά to angry

παροξυντής, ῥαγδρακατέλ, οἴργυντελ one who incites against

παρώργησα, προνεβά, ῥαγδρακά to angry

πατώ, στῆσα, πονηρά to step

πένθείν, παλατά ζε, ῥώδατι cry, weep

πηλός, βρενῆ, προστε earth, dust

πλημελήματα, πραγματεία, εὐγενεία sins, transgressions

πονηράς, ζλῶ, λογκαβύ evil, bad

πόρρωσιν, εκμεθεμένης, ἐμφανεῖ hardening, callousness, of mental and spiritual

πόσα, κολληκτο, κακὸ how

πρωτέρων, πρεσβυῖ, πρώτῳ first, foremost

πτωχόν, νημαγε, οὐβαρά poor

ῥωμφαίοντες, ῥωγήνις, μὴν ἠεμίν sword-carrying
help, inclination

filthy, foul

tossing; swell of the sea; storm

in the arena

steadily

sigh, groan

have mercy

with flesh

suffering, wretched

having the same force

having the same will

punishment, retribution; torment; vengeance

sing, praise, laud

excel, surpass, overpower, go beyond

arrogance

lie above; excel, transcend
υπόδικον, δακή, πεδελεσίματος liable

ψώμα, υψό, ευθυμενής height

φλυαρίας, ευσταθιής, ελεοδολουβη foolery

φρειτή, ευσέβες, ευρίσκει terible, dreadful

φρικωδεστέραις, ευρίσκει, τρεπόμενο dreadful

φρίζει, ογκομετά ce, ευεργετε ce shiver, shudder, with fear and awe; be terrified

φρίσει, εοντε, τρεπομετ tremble with fear

χρισμάτων, δαιφαλιής, ιάλτι favor, gift, spiritual gift; grace

ψυλό ρήματι, προς το γλώσσα, ἁγγί γλώς bare (naked) voice

ψογίστην, καλέσσινια, ογκομετά fault-finder

ὁφελήσει, ογκομετά, ἀπολύοντας οὐ useless

ὡς, ἴα, ζανε as, like

ὡς, ιάκο, ενίκε as, like

ὡσαύτως, ἀποκαλε, τακακε in like manner, just so
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Illustrations from Manuscripts
Illustration 6: Hilandar Monastery Slavic Manuscript 494, ff. 7v-8r
null
Illustration 16: Sveto Troica Monastery (Pljevlja) Slavic Manuscript 63, f. 14v-15r
Illustration 17: Sveto Troica Monastery (Pljevlja) Slavic Manuscript 63, f. 15v-16r
Illustration 18: Sveto Troica Monastery (Pljevlja) Slavic Manuscript 63, f. 16v-17r
Illustration 21: Sveto Troica Monastery (Pljevlja) Slavic Manuscript 63, f. 19v-20r
Illustration 24: Sveto Troica Monastery (Pljevlja) Slavic Manuscript 63, f. 22v-23r
Illustration 28: GIM, Greek Sin 269, ff. 53v-54r
Illustration 29: GiM, Greek Sin 269, ff. 54v-55r
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Illustration 30: GIM, Greek Sin 269, ff. 55v-56r
Illustration 31: GIM, Greek Sin 269, ff. 56v-57r
Illustration 32: GIM, Greek Sin 269, ff. 57v-58r
Illustration 33: GIM, Greek Sin 269, ff. 58v-59r
Illustration 35: GIM, Greek Sin 269, ff. 61v-62r
Illustration 36: GIM, Greek Sin 269, ff. 62v-63r
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Illustration 37: GIM, Greek Sin 269, ff. 64v-65r
Illustration 39: GIM, Greek Sin 269, ff. 66v-67r