

ΚΑΘΑΠΕΡ ΓΑΡ ΤΙΣ ΜΗΤΗΡ
TWO SLAVONIC TRANSLATIONS OF CHAPTERS 25-27 OF
GREGORY OF NYSSA'S *DE HOMINIS OPIFICIO*

γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα,
οὐ βρώμα·
οὕπω γὰρ ἐδύνασθε.
1Cor.3: 2

In the 14th century Gregory of Nyssa's *De hominis opificio*¹ was translated into Slavonic by an anonymous scribe. In the course of preparing an edition of this translation, a comparison with John the Exarch's partial translation of the same text forced itself upon us. John took up three chapters of Gregory's anthropological treatise to supplement his *Bogoslovie*, an abridged translation of John of Damascus' *De fide orthodoxa*². In a previous article we confronted the Greek text with both the translations of chapter 26 (= *O obrazě* 27, *Bogoslovie* 51)³, and, before we proceed to our present set-up, we want to call to mind our findings, complemented with new examples from chapters 25 and 27. We asserted the following:

“AN. [= 14th c. *anonymus*] se distingue de JE [John the Exarch] par son approche ‘homologue’, c’est-à-dire par sa forte tendance à la congruence formelle et à une formulation essentiellement indépendante du contexte. Cette approche s’exprime notamment par un usage fréquent du calque morphologique (...) Tandis qu’AN. essaie de transposer dans le slavon avec les caractéristiques formelles (*λέξις*, *Wortlaut*) tout l’éventail sémantique des mots grecs, la volonté de concordance formelle semble étrangère à JE. Dans son choix des pendants slaves pour les mots grecs polysémiques, il part de la signification de ces mots dans le contexte donné (*δύναμις*, *Sinn*). Plutôt que de reprendre la structure significative polysémique du grec, il tente de l’exclure.”⁴

Some new examples:

¹ Περὶ κατασκευῆς ἀνθρώπου - CPG 3154. See SELS, *La traduction slavonne*. Since volume iv of the *Gregorii Nysseni Opera* (Jaeger, Langerbeck *et al.*, since 1921, Leiden *et al.*) has not yet been published, we have to rely on the edition of FORBES, *De conditione* (1855).

² Ἐκθεσις ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως - CPG 8043. The Exarch's translation of the Gregorian fragments is accessible to us in the edition of SADNIK, “Bruchstücke”, *Anzeiger für slavische Philologie* 10/11 (1979): 163-187 and 12 (1981): 133-169. Other editions are Bodjanskij's (*Čtenija v Imperatorskom Obščestve istorii i drevnostej rossijskich pri Moskovskom universitete*, kn. 4. Moskou 1878), and the edition of the text in Makarij's *Velikije Minei Četii* (Sorokin 1901).

³ See SELS, *Deux traductions*.

⁴ SELS, *Deux traductions*: 150-152.

25.5 GR. γεωργοῦ - γεωργίας - τῷ γεηπόνῳ
 EX. зeмьн(о)мoу д'ѣлaтeлiу – зeмьнaгo д'ѣлa – зeмьнoуmъ тpоу д'ѣннiкoу
 AN. зeмлeд'ѣлaтeлiу – зeмлiєд'ѣл'цѣм – зeмлiєтpъд'нoмъ

25.13 GR. τῆς φιλοσοφίας
 EX. вѣдa ελiнѣскъiа влѣдiи
 AN. лiубoмъд'рiємъ

27.2 GR. διάλογος
 EX. вecѣдoвaнo
 AN. д'ввecлoвiє

27.4 GR. ἀμορφία
 EX. зълo oбpaзъcтвo
 AN. вeзъwбpaзъiє

27.9 GR. τὸ γνωριμώτατον
 EX. eжe кeтъ знaиeмъe
 AN. знaиeмъишeє

27.9 GR. ἀπεργάζεται (said about the womb)
 EX. poд'итъ (context-bound)
 AN. cъд'ѣлoвaєтъ (concordant stem: ~ ἔργον - д'ѣлo)

“La traduction d’AN. présente une concordance nominale plus importante que celle de JE, parce que le choix du matériel lexical est presque toujours indépendant du contexte. (...) La préférence de JE pour l’*Ausdrucksvariation* est connue et on ne rencontre qu’à peine chez lui des pendants fixes.”⁵

Whereas the anonymous translator consequently translates λόγος, for example, by слово⁶, the Exarch regularly produces context-sensitive translations, not uncommonly inclined towards a greater explicitness:

25.9 GR. τῷ προστακτικῷ λόγῳ
 EX. пoвeл'ѣнiємъ
 AN. пoвeл'ѣннiмъ cлoвoмъ

25.10 GR. νεανίαν αὐτὸν ὀνομάζει ὁ λόγος.
 EX. юнoтoу именoуєтъ eвнiглiиe.
 AN. юнoшъ вo тoгo именєєтъ cлoвo.

25.10 GR.... ἐν ὀλίγῳ ... ὁ λόγος ἐτραγώδησε;
 EX.... въ мал'ѣ cъкaзa cтoиe cлoвo?
 AN.... въ мал'ѣ cлoвo cѣтъe нcпoв'ѣдa?

25.12 GR. βεβαιῶσαι τὸν λόγον
 EX. oуcтaвити и oутвѣpд'ити cлoвo oучeннiа
 AN. изъв'єcт'иtи cлoвo

⁵ SELS, o.c.: 153. See the example of σάρξ - σῶμα / πλᾶτς - τ'ѣлo.

⁶ See also SELS, *La traduction*: 169.

We continued:

“Au *niveau de la phrase*, (...) AN. conserve la structure syntaxique du grec – surtout la syntaxe du verbe et de la phrase, et dans une moindre mesure la syntaxe nominale et des cas – et cherche à reprendre la syntaxe souvent hypotactique. Il essaye d’atteindre une équivalence numérique et positionnelle avec le modèle grec. JE procède souvent à la simplification de la structure grammaticale et de l’articulation informative par un réarrangement (souvent paratactique) de l’information, l’abandon ou l’explication de mots. Chez lui, les constructions grecques sont souvent remplacées par des tournures slaves, correspondant au sentiment linguistique de l’époque.”⁷

and

“On observe également chez JE des réductions au *niveau du texte*, notamment par l’abandon de phrases ou de propositions du texte source, considérées manifestement comme superflues ou trop lourdes (...). Il y a aussi des ajouts et des écarts importants par rapport au texte original (...)”⁸

This is illustrated by the following example (chapter 25,3): in the Exarch’s translation, an adnominal genitive becomes an adverbial clause, a parenthesis is left out, information is rearranged, a verb is added and the passive voice becomes active. The anonymous translator, on the other hand, usually preserves the verbal and, to a smaller degree, the nominal syntax of Greek (the use of an adjective instead of an adnominal genitive, for example, constitutes a slight deviation⁹). Furthermore, he tries to maintain the original word order:

GR. ἀλλὰ καὶ παρὰ τὸν τοῦ πάθους καιρὸν, αἱ μὲν γυναῖκες ἐπηκολούθουν θρηνοῦσαι τὴν ἄδικον ἐπ’ αὐτῷ ψῆφον	EX. НЪ И ВЪ ВРЕМЯ, КГДА И РАСПЯША, ЖЕНЪ ГРАДАХОУ ПЛАЧЮЩА СЯ НЕПРАВЪДНАГО УСОУЖДЕНИЯ ЕМОУ;	AN. НЪ И ВЪ СТΡ(Α)СТНОЕ ВРЪМЕ, „ ЖЕНЫ 8БО ПОСЛѢДОВАХЪ РЫДАЮЩЕ НЕПРАВЕДНАГО НА НЕМЪ СЪДА
(οὐπω γὰρ εἰς τὴν τῶν γινομένων οἰκονομίαν ἀπέβλεπον)	omission	— не 8БО ВЪ БЫВАЮЩИХ(Ъ) СЪМОТРЕНІЕ ВЪЗЫРАХОУ –
ὁ δὲ συμβουλευεῖ τὰ μὲν περὶ αὐτὸν γινόμενα σιωπᾶν· μηδὲ γὰρ εἶναι δακρύων ἄξια·	ONЪ же СЪВѢТОВАДШЕ И (Sadnik: rel imъ) МЛЪЧАТН, не бо ДОСТОИННО ПРИНТИЕ СЛЪЗЪ,	WH же СЪВѢТΟΥЕТЬ ІАЖЕ И НЕМЪ БЫВАЕМЪ МЛЪЧАТН, НН БО БЫТН СЛЪЗАМЪ ДУС(ТО)ННА,

⁷ SELS, o.c.: 154.

⁸ Ibid.: 157

⁹ See Ibid.:169.

ὑπερθέσθαι δὲ τὸν ὄδυρμόν	преложити же	ПОДОБАЕТЬ	ωτ(ς)ложити же	рыданіе
καὶ τὸν θρήνον εἰς τὸν	кричь и	ПЛАЧЬ	и ПЛАЧЬ	вѣстниное
ἀληθῇ τῶν δακρύων	достоинное	время	слъзъ,	слъзамь
καιρὸν, ὅταν περισχεθῇ	ѿгда	ωбъсѧдоуѣть	объѣтъ	връме, егда
τοῖς πολιορκούσιν ἢ	ратъници	градъ.	ратнымъ	бодеть
πόλιν.				

As for the style, we noticed that the *anonymus*' approach, i.e. his predilection for formal correspondence and nominal concordance, often results in the preservation of the original rhetorical structure (*anaphora*, *hyperbaton*, *annominatio* etc.)¹⁰. The Exarch's stylistic self-consciousness, on the other hand, is known¹¹: some original stylistic devices are borrowed, others are dropped, while new devices of his own diction appear, independent of the original.

As shown, we were able to point out some major differences in the way translation was approached on the level of lexical units, syntax, textual segmentation, and style. However, our selection of isolated examples could be said to be more persuasive than representative. On the whole, we lingered on an anecdotal level and our conclusion remained all too general:

“Avec Jean l'Exarque et l'anonyme du 14^e siècle, nous avons les deux extrêmes dans le domaine de la traduction : d'une part la traduction ‘analogue’, axée sur la langue cible, et d'autre part l'approche ‘homologue’, axée sur la langue source.”¹²

This binary opposition could almost be put on a par with the tenacious dichotomy between ‘free’ and ‘faithful translation’, which has been the prevailing taxonomy in mainstream thought about translation since antiquity¹³. It is nevertheless clear that, in actual practice, notions like this will cover different meanings depending on what is opposed to them. Not only do they pave the way for subjective value judgements in terms of ‘fidelity’ or ‘betrayal’, but they also fail to do justice to the diversity that actual translations exhibit.

“The normative assumption that translation is either faithful or free (and that if it's faithful it translates either individual words or individual sentences) has blinded us to the full range of even individual translators' actual methodological repertoires, let alone the collective repertoire of all translators taken en masse”.¹⁴

¹⁰ See TROST, *Untersuchungen*: 65-70.

¹¹ See LÄGREID, *Rhetorische Stil*, e.g. the summary: 66. SELS, *Deux traductions*: 158.

¹² SELS, *o.c.*: 159.

¹³ See Cicero's distinction ‘*ut interpretes*’ - ‘*ut orator*’. “Occasionally attempts are made to introduce a third term (e.g. Dryden [1680] 1975), but the overall polarity has long remained between these two extremes”, CHESTERMAN, *Memes*: 12. ROBINSON, “Free translation”, *RETS*: 87-90, sees the beginning of a three-part taxonomy with Jerome: *sense-for-sense* (*sensus de sensu*) as a faithful middle ground between *word-for-word* (*verbum e verbo*) and *free*, recurring e.g. in John Dryden's (1631-1700) *metaphrase*, *paraphrase* and *imitation*.

¹⁴ ROBINSON, “Free translation”, *RETS*: 89-90.

Descriptive Translation Studies

Having acknowledged some shortcomings in our previous approach, we will turn to the field of *Translation Studies* (TS), a discipline now generally considered as autonomous. However, in 1985 Toury still qualified TS as ‘*a discipline-in-the-making*’, ascribing its incompleteness, among other things, to the want of a systematical descriptive branch as an inherent to TS as a whole. Ten years later, in his 1995 monograph, Toury felt compelled to repeat his observation¹⁵. The importance of interaction between the ‘pure’ theoretical and the descriptive branch of TS was also pointed out by Lambert and van Gorp:

“(...) the importance of descriptive studies for translation theory has not been sufficiently recognized. This explains why the concrete study of translations and translational behaviour in particular socio-cultural contexts has often remained isolated from current theoretical research, and why there is still, on the whole, a wide gap between the theoretical and the descriptive approach. (...) Indeed, our methodology in this respect too often remains purely intuitive.”¹⁶

As for the theory of translation, a major change of focus has to be taken into account¹⁷. The shift from *langue* to *parole* already marked a rift in the basically linguistic trend (language as a code and translation as ‘code-switching’¹⁸). However, it was the introduction of a more functionally and socio-culturally oriented concept of translation that resulted in a ‘dethronement’ of the source text and a devaluation of the formerly dominant notion of ‘equivalence’¹⁹. Situational factors such as the communicative purpose or *skopos* of a translation and the expectancy norms of the receptor culture were now being accounted for as important determiners for translation strategies, and thus for the specificity of the relation between the source text and the target

¹⁵ TOURY, *Rationale*: 16-17, and *ID.*, *Descriptive Translation Studies*: 1-2. Striking is the fact that a lemma ‘descriptive translation studies’ is lacking in the fairly recent *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (1998).

¹⁶ LAMBERT – VAN GORP, *Describing Translations*: 42.

¹⁷ See e.g. the historical overview by NORD, *Translating*: 1-13.

¹⁸ CHESTERMAN, *Memes*: 30-33, and FAWCETT, “Linguistic approaches”, *RETS*: 120-125. See e.g. the typical opening words in Catford’s *Linguistic Theory*: 1, “Translation is an operation performed on languages: a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another. Clearly, then, any theory of translation must draw upon a theory of language – a general linguistic theory.”

¹⁹ See VAN DEN BROECK, *Concept of Equivalence*. Also KENNY, “Equivalence”, *RETS*: 77-80, “Proponents of equivalence-based theories of translation usually define equivalence as the relationship between the source text and a target text that allows the TT to be considered as a translation of the ST in the first place.” Some scholars have drawn attention to the circularity of the argumentation, e.g. CHESTERMAN, *Memes*: 10. The key position of this notion of ‘sameness’ between source text and target text has been contested, particularly within the framework of the younger target-oriented (functionalist, norm-based) approaches.

text²⁰. Influential in this respect are norm-based approaches²¹, drawing on Even-Zohar's polysystem theory²². The standards against which translations are measured, i.e. the norms that govern the prevailing concept of equivalence in a given socio-cultural context, are brought into focus.

"The norms that determine the particular concept of equivalence prevalent at different stages in history, or amongst different schools of translators, or even within the work of a single translator, then constitute a valid object of enquiry for descriptive translation studies."²³

"*Translations are facts of one system only: the target system*"²⁴. Therefore, a translation should not solely be approached as a mirror image of a source text, but as a 'new' text as well, serving its own communicative purpose as an element of a particular target system. It will not do to comment on surface textual-linguistic representations, although establishing the particular relation between source text and target text – e.g. by pointing out optional shifts or translational strategies²⁵ – remains an important task in translation description²⁶.

²⁰ See SCHÄFFNER, "Skopos theory", *RETS*: 235-238. See also MASON, "Communicative / functional approaches", *RETS*: 29-33.

²¹ TOURY, *Nature and Role of Norms*, and *ID.*, *Descriptive Translation Studies*: 53-69. See BAKER, "Norms", *RETS*: 163-165 and CHESTERMAN, *Memes*: 33-40.

²² Translation as a sub-system within the literary 'polysystem', i.e. a differentiated and dynamic conglomerate of systems, that, embedded in larger cultural and socio-economical structures, undergoes constant change due to internal shifts and contradictions (e.g. between conservative and innovative, between centre and periphery). EVEN-ZOHAR, *Polysystem theory*.

²³ KENNY, "Equivalence", *RETS*: 77-80.

²⁴ TOURY, *Rationale*: 19. See also LAMBERT - VAN GORP: *Describing Translations*: 46-47, "(...) no translation ever accepts either T1 [= source text] or S1 [(literary) system of the source text] as its exclusive model; it will inevitably contain all kinds of interferences deriving from the target system."

²⁵ See POPOVIČ's definition, *Concept*: 79, "All that appears as new with respect to the original, or fails to appear where it might have been expected, may be interpreted as a shift."; See also BAKKER *et.al.*, "Shifts of translation", *RETS*: 226-231 and VAN DEN BROECK – LEFEVERE, *Uitnodiging*: 95-100. CHESTERMAN, *Memes*: 87-115, uses the process-oriented notion 'translational strategy' instead of the product-oriented term 'shift', p.92: "one way to look at strategies in more detail is in fact to see them as kinds of changes. (...) Such a view has led to a number of classifications of changes which have traditionally been thought of as being from source to target text, as various kinds of transfer operations or formal shifts".

²⁶ "The different translation strategies evident in the text itself provide the most explicit information about the relations between the source and target systems, and about the translator's position in and between them", LAMBERT en VAN GORP, *Describing translations*: 47. CHESTERMAN also stresses the relevance for TS of contrastive analysis, in spite of its rejection by some functionalists. Within the framework of norm theory the question of how different translational norms are actually attained in practice remains relevant. *Memes*: 79-80, 85.

Distance as an obstacle

In scrutinising medieval translations we are, however, aware of the specific difficulties that inhere in our subject. A first problem is posed by the texts themselves. Since we do not dispose of editions which are authorised by the writer or the translator, it is only with the greatest caution that we can speak of *the* source text or *the* target text. Research departing from a branch of the written tradition of the source text, other than the one used by the translator, cannot but lead to wrong conclusions concerning the translator's competence or method²⁷. A similar problem arises when one departs from secondary readings or scribal errors in the translation²⁸.

A second obstacle is the fact that some elements escape our understanding due to chronological and cultural distances. The exact referential meaning of a word sometimes eludes us (e.g. some culture-bound notions, realia,...), but more often we fail to notice the connotative meaning of words. Also the degree to which concrete translational solutions, such as neologisms or semantic calques, were properly understood by the target audience, or the way they were perceived – as familiar or 'foreignising' – often remains obscure.

"The major difficulty in determining whether a polyseme has been mistranslated is the fact that it remains uncertain whether a Slavonic root with all its cognates was being given the same meaning as the equivalent Greek root with its cognates."²⁹

An additional problem in the Slavonic field is the scarcity, at an early stage, of original, untranslated texts as material for comparison³⁰. Even the degree to which this 'unnatural' literary language was *in se* felt as 'foreignising', in a given period or by a given segment of the public, cannot readily be ascertained.

Another difficulty is the limited availability of extra-textual information, such as data about the translator, the communicative context, the intended

²⁷ Exemplars of medieval translators not uncommonly displayed *lacunae* and abridgements. Ignorance of the specificity of the source text often prompted scholars to ascribe the omissions to the translator, see e.g. WEITEMEIER: *Latin Adaptation*: 101-102. Examples from the Slavic field in TOMSÄN, *Sravnjavane*: 289-294, and ID., *John the Exarch*: 45-46. See also ÅGREN, *Problem*: 1-72.

²⁸ See e.g. the remarks by THOMSON, *John the Exarch*: 47 and 58, "Some of the examples which have been quoted as instances of John's misunderstanding the Greek are also the result of later scribal corruption", and "To censure him for not coining a one-to-one equivalent theological and philosophical terminology not merely ignores the textological evidence of the variants, which indicates that it was more uniform than hitherto suspected, (...)". For John's *Bogoslovie*, known to us only in relatively late copies, it is not always easy to discern precisely what goes back to the Exarch himself. The 14th-century translation is less problematic in this respect, because the text witnesses stay close to the putative time of translation, exhibiting relatively few linguistic and textual differences among themselves.

²⁹ THOMSON, *John the Exarch*: 50.

³⁰ For the discernment of loan syntax, for instance. See RŮŽICKA, *Lehnsyntax*.

audience, the reception of the text etc. We usually have to make do with a broad historico-cultural frame. The scarcity of medieval reflection on translation, as made explicit in paratexts, should also be taken into account here. Our modern preoccupation with context was not shared by medieval bookmen:

“The participants in Orthodox Slavonic book culture were more interested in truth than in context. Explicit information about – or by – translators is very rare indeed. (...) Few translators are known, fewer still are known from their own words. We can assess their achievements with modern tools of translation-analysis, but we have little opportunity to hear what *they* thought they were doing, how *they* viewed the task of transferring the written word from one language into another.”³¹

We indeed have to pay attention to the huge discrepancy between the world views and language conceptions of medieval bookmen and modern scholars. Whereas the present translation analysts want to dispose of terminology qualifying translations in terms of fidelity or betrayal, precisely this distinction was crucial to medieval translators. Phenomena such as the 14th century *ispravlenie knig* have to be viewed in this context, the focus being on ‘correctness’ and truth/orthodoxy³². While present-day functionalists tend to minimise the importance of the source text as a yardstick, to the medieval scribe the often highly prestigious source language text was a receptacle of truth. That is why 14th century Slavic bookmen fell back on the Greek models, which were believed to guarantee orthodoxy.

Franklin rightly reminds us “...how easy it is to *filter the past through the potentially distorting prism of our own terminology*”³³, a truism, even for the most current terminology, as, for instance, the word ‘writer’³⁴. Likewise, our relativistic notion of meaning, as something which only crystallises in the process of communication, contrasts sharply with the dominant medieval conception of absolute and unchangeable meaning.³⁵

³¹ FRANKLIN, *Writing*: 207. The author mentions five utterances of early translators about their work, namely the one in the *Macedonian Folium*, John the Exarch’s preface, and the statements of John the Presbyter, Konstantin of Preslav and Feodosii.

³² The connection between linguistic corruption and doctrinal error was emphasized, see e.g. Konstantin Kosteneckij’s *Treatise on the Letters*: “*Blasphemy in the letters is the enemy of God*”, GOLDBLATT, *Orthography and Orthodoxy*: 113, and Gregory Camblak in his *Encomium of Patriarch Euthymius* on the early translations: “*they concealed in themselves many errors and were not in agreement with the true dogmas. Thereupon many heresies arose from them*”, GOLDBLATT, *Textual Restoration*: 136-137.

³³ FRANKLIN, *Writing*: 218.

³⁴ FRANKLIN, *Writing*: 217-223. The activities of an author, translator, compiler,... were not as strictly marked as they are today. For instance, translations did not necessarily present themselves as such. Our notion of authorial creativity and originality cannot be mapped on medieval conceptions.

³⁵ notably because of the assumed existence of an intrinsic and unbreakable bond between the word and its referent. See THOMSON, *Sensus*: 675-677, *ID.*, *John the Exarch*: 39-41, *ID.*, *Évolution*: 322-323. Also CHESTERMAN, *Memes*: 20-21.

Description. The preliminary data.

We will now bring into focus the objects of our research from a target-oriented point of view. We will outline the historico-cultural contexts from which John's *Bogoslovie* and the anonymous translator's *O obrazě* arose. Although the status of the texts as translations has firmly been established, the way the texts present themselves in prefaces and headings deserves our attention, as well as the specificity of the source text copies used for the two translations. Furthermore, we will discuss the choice of the material to be translated, the factors that apparently affected this selection, and the new textual environments in which the translations were embedded.

A few decades after the introduction, together with the Writ, of writing, the Bulgarian cities of Ohrid and Preslav flourished as centres of a supra-national Slavo-Byzantine culture. The first golden age of Bulgarian literature, under the rule of the cultivated *hemiargos* Symeon (893-927), witnessed an intense literary activity, impelled by the needs of the young Church.

"Next to the Bible, the provision of liturgical books (...) was the first prerequisite for setting up the new Slavonic churches. The next stage was to provide these churches with a means of consolidating and spreading the new faith and of defending it against paganism and heresy."³⁶

"..., the choice and adaptation of that literature translated during the period of the first Bulgarian empire were clearly dictated by the needs of the Bulgarian church and its mission of evangelization."³⁷

Whereas translations tend to assume a peripheral and servile position in the literary system of the recipient culture³⁸, this was not the case in the early written culture of the Slavs. The absence of a norm shaping system of original literature allowed translations of liturgical and para-liturgical texts³⁹, initially of Cyrillo-Methodian descent, to model the conventions of writing⁴⁰, heavily influenced by the Greek language⁴¹ and the Byzantine literary models⁴².

³⁶ OBOLENSKY, *Byzantine Commonwealth*: 327.

³⁷ THOMSON, *Continuity*: 143.

³⁸ See EVEN-ZOHAR, *Position*: 124, and *ID.*, *Polysystem theory*: 300. Also TOURY, *Descriptive Translation Studies*: 272.

³⁹ For the overwhelming share of religious literature in the early Slavonic sources, see ROTHE, *Sakrale Grundlagen*.

⁴⁰ "To say that translated literature maintains a primary position is to say that it participates actively in modelling the centre of the polysystem. In such a situation it is by and large an integral part of innovatory forces, and as such likely to be identified with major events in literary history while these are taking place." EVEN-ZOHAR, *Position*: 120.

⁴¹ For the influence of Greek on Old Church Slavonic, see, amongst others, VEČERKA, *Influence*.

We must see John the Exarch's *Bogoslovie* against this background. The heading and preface immediately present the text as a translation, mentioning the translator and the original author, John of Damascus: "прѡлогъ сѣтворенъ иваномъ прозвѣтеръмъ ексархомъ бѣларьскомъ, иже естъ и прѣложилъ книгъ снѣ", and some lines farther down "прѣложихъ стго ивана презвѣтера дамакина"⁴³. The sources of the appendices to John's abridged translation of the *De fide* are not mentioned. The fragments are consecutively numbered as chapters 49 to 54, linking up directly with the chapters from the *De fide*. However, it is clear from the present state of research that chapters 50-52 go back to chapters 25-27 of Gregory of Nyssa's *De hominis opificio*⁴⁴. The three thematically connected fragments deal with the doctrine of the resurrection⁴⁵.

Despite social and political tensions, a thriving of Slavic letters and arts marked the 14th century, that would end in the Ottoman dominance over the Balkans. Contacts between Greek, Serb and Bulgarian cultural centres were intense, while hesychasm occupied the minds of Greek and Slav monks alike⁴⁶. A reassessment of the role of Church Slavonic and its relationship to Greek could be observed, particularly in the movement associated with Euthymius, patriarch of Trnovo. LaBauve Hébert mentions a change in the 'metalinguistic tradition':

"While the Cyrillo-Methodian metalinguistic tradition was concerned with shaping and establishing a Slavic vernacular for religious purposes, the Euthymian metalinguistic tradition was primarily focused on ensuring that that vernacular (Church Slavonic) enjoy equal prestige with Greek."⁴⁷

The emancipation of Church Slavonic as a standard language was believed to emerge from an even closer proximity to the prestigious Greek. A heavily ornated rhetoric, inspired by Byzantine models, flourished both in translations and original works.

"However, by the XIV century the level of learning in Bulgaria had risen to such an extent that the same theological and philosophical issues which were exercising the minds of

⁴² For the cultural heritage of the Greek-speaking word and the influence of Byzantine literary models, see, amongst others, OBOLENSKY: *Commonwealth*: 322 and further.

⁴³ SADNIK, *Ἑκθεσις*: 2 and 18.

⁴⁴ SADNIK, *Bruchstücke*: 10/11 (1979) 163-187 and 12 (1981): 133-169.

⁴⁵ In chapters 25-27, Gregory contends that the doctrine of the Resurrection, or the eventual 'Restoration of man', is confirmed by the accuracy of other predictions in the Scriptures, and by the accounts of people being raised from the death, not in the least Christ Himself. Gregory refutes the apparent impossibility of a 'Restoration' by pointing to well-known parallels in nature, and to the boundlessness of the Divine power.

⁴⁶ See e.g. OBOLENSKY, *Commonwealth*: 336-340; LABAUVE HÉBERT, *Hesychasm*: 393-434; WHITE, *Hesychasm*; HEPPEL, *Hesychast Movement*.

⁴⁷ LABAUVE HÉBERT, *o.c.*: 41.

Byzantine churchmen were equally burning topics in Bulgaria. (...). The major dogmatic movement in the XIV century was hesychasm and not only were the works of its leading exponents Gregory Sinaites and Gregory Palamas immediately translated, so too were the mystical works of those fathers who had inspired them, among whom was Gregory of Nyssa, whose *De hominis opificio* was among the translations.”⁴⁸

From this ‘late medieval, ‘Euthymian’ recension of Byzantine culture’⁴⁹ arose the anonymous text *O obrazě*. Though the text does not present itself as a translation, the original author and title are mentioned: ο ωβραζυτς чл(овѣ)ка⁵⁰, бл(а)женаго грηγορία, брата с(вѣ)т(а)го вачлїа. A comparison with Forbes’ edition of the *De hominis opificio* leaves no doubt as to the identification of Gregory’s treatise as the source text of the *O obrazě*. This full translation was probably produced together with a translation of Basil’s *Homiliae IX in Hexaemeron*, both texts forming a whole named *Šestodnevnik* or *Hexaemeron*⁵¹.

The source text relevant to our present purpose then consists of three chapters of Gregory’s commentary on Genesis 1.26, probably written around 379 as a conscious addition to Basil’s homilies on creation. In this work, betraying strong Platonising tendencies, Gregory elaborates the themes of God’s image in man and the mystical ascent⁵². Not only does Gregory exhibit a remarkable familiarity with secular learning in the fields of music, medicine, physics and cosmology, he also falls back on contemporary rhetoric.

However, the identity of John’s source text with the one used by the *anonymus* should be put into perspective. It is most unlikely that the Exarch’s copy of the Greek *De hominis opificio* presented the text precisely as it was conceived by Gregory of Nyssa in the 4th century (not to mention the text as it was retrieved by Forbes in his 1855 edition). Furthermore, the exemplar used by the 14th century translator probably deviated from the original Greek in some aspects, as well as from John’s copy, while the possibility that one or both translators used more than one Greek exemplar cannot be excluded. Therefore,

⁴⁸ THOMSON, *Continuity*: 144.

⁴⁹ BOLENSKY, *Commonwealth*: 340.

⁵⁰ The translation of the title does not correspond to the common Greek title, Περὶ κατασκευῆς ἀνθρώπου. The *incipit* parallels that of ms. c (Lamb.3, cod. 63) in Forbes’ edition: Περὶ εἰκόνοσ ἀνθρώπου· τοῦ μακαρίου γρηγορίου ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ ἁγίου βασιλείου.

⁵¹ See SELS, *Deux traductions*: 138, n. 11. It remains unclear if Gregory’s treatise already constituted a whole with Basil’s text in the Greek exemplar, and if they were translated by the same translator(s).

⁵² The very notion of ὁμοίωσις θεῷ is an echo from Plato’s *Theaetetus*, previously picked up by Middle- and Neo-Platonism. The *De hominis opificio* tends to be called a ‘Christian *Timaeus*’ (just as Gregory’s *De anima et resurrectione* has been labelled as a ‘Christian *Phaedo*’). Gregory’s work has unmistakably been influenced by Plotinus and Origenes. See among others DÖRRIE in RAC: 890-893 and CANEVET in DS: 979-984.

some parts of the translations cannot be considered as different translational solutions for the same source text problems.

It is necessary, then, that we clarify the degree to which the models of both translators were similar. We previously pointed out that the 14th century translation goes back to one particular branch of the Greek textual tradition⁵³. We then demonstrated by means of examples from chapter 26 that the Exarch's model could also be linked to this branch⁵⁴. Some new examples from chapters 25 and 27 show both translations following the same variant readings⁵⁵:

25.12 GR. ἔδει γὰρ ἐν ἑτέροις σώμασι προσεθίσαντα* τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῷ κατὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν θαύματι, ἐν τῷ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἀνθρώπῳ* βεβαιῶσαι τὸν λόγον⁵⁶.

Var. * προσεθίσαντας **q** ; * ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ σαρκὶ καθ' ἑαυτὸν **abi**
EX. ПОДОБО [Sadnik: lies *podoba*] БЛАСИ ИНѢМІ ПЛЗТНЗИМИ *приоучьше*
[Sadnik: lies –šъ (?)] ЧЛВКЪИ О ВЪСТАНЪНЪЕМЪ ЧОУДѢСЕ ВЪ СВОЕИ ПЛЗТИ
собою оуставити и оутврѣдити слово оучения.

AN. ПОД(О)БАСЕ БО, ВЪ ИНѢХ(Ъ) ТѢЛЕСЕХ(Ъ) *WBЫКШІИМЪ* ЧЛ(ОВѢ)КΩМЪ
ЕЖЕ ВЪ ВЪСКР(Ъ)СЕНН ЧЮДОМЪ, ВЪ СВОЕИ ПЛЪТИ ВЪ СЕБѢ НЪВѢСТНТИ СЛОВО.

27.2 GR. διὰ τῆς συνανακράσεως*

Var. * νῦν ἀνακράσεως **bimqt**

EX. НЪИНѢШЬНИИМЪ РАСТВОРОМЪ

AN. РАСТВОРЕНІЕМЪ Н(Ы)НѢШННМЪ

27.3 GR. Οὐκοῦν οὐδὲν* ἔξω τοῦ ἔικotos ἐστὶ...

Var. * οὐκ **abirt**

EX. ДА НѢСТЬ КРОМѢ ЛѢПОТЪИ...

AN. прочее *не* ВЪНѢ ПОД(О)БНАГО *и*с(ТЬ)...

However, the following examples demonstrate that both Greek copies were indeed different in some points:

25.3 GR. Forbes: περὶ τὴν τεκνοφάγον

EX. О ТѢДОУЩИИ ЧАДО СВОЕ ЖЕНѢ

GR.var. **q**: περὶ τὴν τεκνοφαγίαν

AN. Ѡ ЧЕДОІАДЕНІѢ

27.7 GR. Forbes: τί καινὸν εἶ καὶ ἐν τῷ τῆς ἀναστάσεως λόγῳ...

EX. ТО ЧОУДО ЛИ *и*с(ТЬ), *а*и~~ме~~ И ВЪ ВЪСТАНЪНЪИИ ДНЬ...

GR.var. **abimnq**: εἶ *om.*

AN. ЧТО ЧЮДНО И ВЪ ВЪСКР(Ъ)СЕНІА СЛОВѢ

⁵³ In his preface FORBES, *De conditione*: 98, distinguishes between two manuscript 'families'; both Slavonic translations follow the group *abcikmnqrt* (sigla Forbes). See SELS, *Traduction*: 150.

⁵⁴ See SELS, *Deux traductions*: 150.

⁵⁵ For the examples from chapter 26, see SELS, *o.c.*: 150.

⁵⁶ Translation of MOORE and WILSON: 417, "For it behoved Him, when He had accustomed men to the miracle of the resurrection in other bodies, to confirm His word in His own humanity."

We formerly suggested that the younger translator could have been influenced by the Exarch's work⁵⁷. It is not wholly unlikely that the *anonymus* had a copy of John's *Bogoslovie* at his disposal. However, even if John's translation was known to him, the development of Church Slavonic and the changed concept of translation probably would have restrained him from borrowing. Verbatim parallels, even partial, are scarce, apart from some quotes from the Scriptures. The texts do not provide us with arguments for the possible acquaintance of the 14th century translator with John's work, and influence of the latter should be ruled out.

Lambert and van Gorp, among others, pointed out the relevance for descriptive translation studies of preliminary data such as paratexts⁵⁸. Whereas the *anonymus*, as most medieval bookmen, does not preface or comment his translation, the Exarch's *prolog* to the *Bogoslovie* is one of the rare utterances by medieval Slavic translators about their work⁵⁹. The subject has received much scholarly attention, so we will not deal with it at length⁶⁰.

John indicates that he translates “*разоумѣ ради (...), а не тѣчью глѣз истовъзнихъ радѣма* (for the sake of the sense and not merely for the sake of the true lexemes)”⁶¹, and that he uses the ‘equivalent’ or ‘homosemantic sense’ instead of the ‘true lexeme’⁶² wherever this is necessary. However, the translational problems he brings up in his preface mainly relate to the word level⁶³.

“Broadly speaking, the prefaces and colophons imply a word-by-word approach to translation, or at any rate an approach which focuses on small semantic units (...) rather than large semantic structures.”⁶⁴

⁵⁷ We previously drew attention to a small but interesting parallel, namely the use by both translators of the exclusive *своимъ* / *своимъ* for *ἡμέτερος*, no variant readings being mentioned by Forbes; elsewhere in the 14th century translation *ἡμέτερος* has consequently been translated with *нашъ*. Possibly *своимъ* goes back to a lost Greek variant. SELS, *Deux traductions*: 157, n.70.

⁵⁸ LAMBERT – VAN GORP, *Describing Translations*: 52

⁵⁹ See *supra*, note 33.

⁶⁰ For a bibliography on the subject, see PODSKALSKY, *Theologische Literatur*: 145.

⁶¹ SADNIK, *Ἐκθεσις*: 26-28, translation by THOMSON, *John the Exarch*: 41.

⁶² For the notions ‘*istovoe slovo* / *ἔτυμος λέξις*’ (the true lexeme / word) and the alternative of ‘*razumъ istovyj tožde mogušъ* / *ἔτυμος ὁμοδύναμος δύναμις*’ (the true homosemantic / equi-valent sense), see FRANKLIN, *Writing*: 210-215, THOMSON, *John the Exarch*: 40-41, and HANSACK, *Kyrillisch-Mazedonische Blatt*: 395-405.

⁶³ “*небонъ иже глѣз вѣ inomъ ѡзъицѣ краснѣ, то вѣ дроуѣмѣ некраснѣ, иже вѣ inomъ страшнѣ, то вѣ дроуѣмѣ нестрашнѣ, иже вѣ inomъ чьстѣнѣ, то вѣ дроуѣмѣ нечьстѣнѣ. и еже има мочьско, то вѣ inomъ женьско (...)* и пакъзи глѣмъ елиньскъ: панъта та ези, а словѣньскъ: вси ѡзъици”, SADNIK, *Ἐκθεσις*: 24-26.

⁶⁴ FRANKLIN, *Writing*: 215.

A broader view of his task as a translator or data about his intended audience are lacking in the preface, but the Exarch does mention an admonition by the monk Doks, who confronts him with his duty as a priest to translate the ‘*učitel'skaja sьkazaniya*’⁶⁵. The implicit ‘translator’s intention’ then cannot be separated from the context in which the Exarch wrote, namely in the service of the young Bulgarian Church:

“The immediate task facing the Bulgarian church in the IX an X centuries was the inculcation of the basic tenets of the new faith and its attendant morality.”⁶⁶

Another, previously neglected, difference between the two translations is what we would call the ‘general strategy’ or ‘translation policy’⁶⁷, i.e. the selection of the material to be translated and the new textual environments in which they were integrated.

The Exarch did not select chapters 25-27 of the *De hominis opificio* at random. They responded to existing needs, while the text as a whole – a highly erudite work on mystical theology – did not.

“Mystical theology was (...) beyond the capacity of the neophytes and of all of Gregory of Nyssa’s works only three brief excerpts from his *De hominis opificio* are found as the second, third and fourth appendices to the adaptation of John of Damascus’ *De fide orthodoxa*.”⁶⁸

Five out of six of the appendices to the *Bogoslovie*, including the Gregorian fragments, concern the doctrine of the resurrection, one of the basic tenets of Faith⁶⁹. In a period of consolidation of the Bulgarian church, they were embedded in the first work of systematic theology translated into Slavonic. As Thomson rightly pointed out, it is hardly surprising that precisely the *De fide*, a ‘*summa philosophica et theologica* of the patristic age’, was translated in this period⁷⁰.

⁶⁵ “ЧЪСТЫНЪИИ ЧЛВКЪ ДОУКЕЪ ЧРЪНОРИЗЪЦЪ ПРИЛЕЖЕ МЪНѢ, (...) ВЕЛѦ МИ И МОЛѦ ПРЕЛОЖИТИ ОУЧИТЕЛЬСКАЯ СЪКАЗАНИЯ, И ВЪСПОМИНАА МИ РЕЧЕ: ПОПОВИ ЧЪТО ЕСТЬ ИНО ДѢЛО РАЗВѢ ОУЧЕНЬА? ДА ЕЛЪМА ЖЕ ЕСИ СЛОУЖЬБОУ ТОУ ПРИНАЛЪ, ТО И СЕ ТИ НОУЖДА ЕСТЬ ДѢЛАТИ”, SADNIK, *Εκθεσις*: 6-8.

⁶⁶ THOMSON, *Continuity*: 142.

⁶⁷ LAMBERT – VAN GORP, *Describing translations*: 52. TOURY, *Nature and Role of Norms*: 86.

⁶⁸ THOMSON, *Continuity*: 143.

⁶⁹ The other appendices to the *Bogoslovie*: chap. 49, under the heading *O věřě*, partly based on the chapter Περί πίστεως from the Ἑλληνικῶν θεραπευτικῇ παθημάτων of Theodoret of Cyrus (*AsPh* 9,2); chap. 53, *Nevěrnaago vъprosъ* (*AsPh* 10/11), contains the translation of a part of Gregory of Nyssa’s dialogue with Macrina on the soul and the resurrection (Περί ψυχῆς καὶ ἀναστάσεως ὁ λόγος); there is no known model for chap. 54, *Prikladi ô vъstanii*. It is possible that the Exarch wrote this last chapter independently, see SADNIK, *Prikladi*.

⁷⁰ Thomson also explains the abridgement as a conscious adaptation of the text to a new, recently converted public. THOMSON, *John the Exarch*: 37.

The 14th century *anonymus* translated the text in full, presented as a whole together with Basil's homilies on creation. Apparently there was an audience for Gregory's text in this period, not only due, perhaps, to the increased level of learning, but also to the rising interest in mystical works within the hesychast movement⁷¹. We should also mention the apparent popularity, "*ohne deutlich ersichtlichen Grund*", of the hexameral literature⁷². Possibly, Gregory's text also profited from its connection to Basil's *Homiliae*, because homilies were still at the very centre of the literary system.

Description. Micro-level analysis.

We will now proceed to the comparison of both translations with the source text on a micro-level. Within the scope of the present article, however, we have to confine ourselves to a representative fragment. We have chosen the elaborate simile in chapter 25,7 (not wholly without considerations concerning the content)⁷³. We will not, as we previously did, compare isolated words. Rather than laying down the units for comparison *a priori*, we will define them in the process of mapping the translation onto its source text counterpart.

"Thus, the analyst will go about establishing a segment of the target text, for which it would be possible to claim that – beyond its boundaries – there are no leftovers of the solution to a translation problem which is represented by one of the source text's segments, whether similar or different in rank and scope" - "the units of comparative analysis would always emerge as coupled pairs of target- and source-segments, 'replacing' and 'replaced' items, respectively."⁷⁴

In this way, we will try to reconstruct the translation decisions made by the Exarch and the anonymous translator.

7. Καθάπερ γάρ τις μήτηρ καταλλήλως τιθηνουμένη τὸ νήπιον, τέως μὲν ἀπαλῶ τε καὶ ὑγρῶ τῷ στόματι τὸ γάλα διὰ τῆς θηλῆς ἐντίθησιν·
For as a mother who nurses her babe with due care for a time supplies milk by her breast to its mouth while still tender and soft;

Ex.: ꙗкоже бо и мати противоу младенцю и ѿдъ емоу даѣтъ, за
млада млекѣмъ надаваючи,
Denwie auch eine Mutter angemessen dem Kleinkind ihm auch die Speise gibt,
indem sie für das zarte (Kind) (sie) als Milch reicht,

⁷¹ See supra, note 48.

⁷² See PODSKALSKY's bibliography on the subject, *Theologische Literatur*: 227-228.

⁷³ FORBES, *De conditione hominis*: 256, with English translation by MOORE and WILSON, *Select Writings*: 415. The Exarch's text with German translation is given according to the edition by Sadnik, *Bruchstücke*, *AslPh* 10/11: 172-174. The 14th century text is taken from our edition in preparation.

⁷⁴ TOURY, *Descriptive Translation Studies*: 79 and 89.

AN.: ἸΑκοже वो нѣкаа м(а)тн, ποΔ(ο)βнѣ пнтаюцин млаΔ,ѣн'ца*, Δο нѣчесого оубо мек'кым' же н моκротнымъ ѡстомъ млѣко съцѣмъ вьла҃гаєть;

* ΠΗΤΑΙΟΥΝ ΜΛΑΔ,ѢН'ЦΑ et sim. Ch,N : ΠΗΤΑΙΟΥΝΗΜΗ ΜΛ(Α)Δ,(Ѣ)ΝЦΑ et sim. R,Z,B

The Exarch's translation of this fragment should, as a whole, be considered as a replacing segment for its source text counterpart. There is hardly any room for breaking down the sentence any further. The syntactic structure deviates from that of the source text: [μήτηρ] τιθηνομένη... ἐντίθησιν > [ΜΑΤΗ] ѢΔЬ ΔΑЄТЬ... НАΔΑΒΑЮЩИ: the Greek conjunct participle has become the main verb, the Greek main verb a conjunct participle⁷⁵. διὰ τῆς θηλῆς is left implicit in ΜΛΕΚΖΜЬ НАΔΑΒΑЮЩИ. ЗА ΜΛΑΔΔ (ΜΛΑΔΖ meaning ἀπαλός as well as νήπιος, νεός) replaces the ἀπαλῶ τε καὶ ὑγρῶ τῷ στόματι, a change that cannot be isolated from the use of НАΔΑΒΑΤΗ for ἐντίθημι, whereby the couple of near-synonyms (ἀπαλῶ τε καὶ ὑγρῶ) is lost. In general, the diction is stripped of all the frills of the Greek original.

Establishing the replacing segments in the 14th century translation brings us to the level of words and, to some extent, of morphemes (ἐν-τίθησιν - ВЬ-ЛА҃ГАЄТЬ) and small phrases (τέως - Δο нѣчесого; διὰ τῆς θηλῆς - съцѣмъ). These words or semantic units tend to take the same place as their source text counterparts, at the surface (word sequence) as well as structurally (syntax). Lexically, the translator often uses fixed pendants for Greek words, with a predilection for formal correspondence.

ὀδοντοφυοῦντι δὲ ἤδη καὶ αὐξανομένῳ προσάγει τὸν ἄρτον, οὐ τραχύν τε καὶ ἀκατέργαστον, ὥς ἂν μὴ περιξανθείη τῷ σκληρῷ τῆς τροφῆς τὸ τῶν οὐλῶν ἀπαλόν τε καὶ ἀγύμναστον, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἰδίοις ὀδοῦσι καταλεάνασα, σύμμετρόν τε καὶ κατάλληλον τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ προσφερομένου ἐποίησεν·
and when it begins to grow and to have teeth she gives it bread, not hard or such as it cannot chew, so that the tender and unpractised gums may not be chafed by rough food; but softening it with her own teeth, she makes it suitable and convenient for the powers of the eater;

EX.: А АКО ѡЗОНѢАТѢЄТЬ, ТАКО ХЛѢБА НАΔΔЄТЬ НЕ СОНХА, НЗ САМА СЗЖИВАЮЩИ, ДА ЕМОУ НЕ ВРЕДИТЬ ДІАСНЗ*, 376a-b ΕΔΙΝΑΚΟ НЕ ΟΥΤΒΡΕΔΙΒΖШЮ СІА*,
aber wie es Zähne bekommt, so (ihm) Brot gibt (und zwar) nicht trockenes, sondern (es) selbst kaut, damit es ihm nicht das Zahnfleisch verletze, das sich noch nicht gefestigt hat,

⁷⁵ The Exarch's habit to place the main verb at the beginning of a sentence has previously been pointed out: "Lorsque le verbe principal grec ne s'exprime qu'à la fin de la phrase, JE recherche l'antéposition afin de favoriser la transparence", SELS, *Deux traductions*: 155.

* II, IV, VIII *desny*; Ursprüngliche Leseart *dēsny*.

* Zu lesen sicher –*v̄sē sē*, Gen. Übereingestimmt mit *dēsny*.

AN.: ΖΟΥΒΥ ЖЕ ΗΖΡΑΣΤΑΙΟΥΜΣ ΙΟΥΕ Η ΡΑΣΤΕΙΟΥΜΣ ΠΡΗΝΟΣΗΤΉ ΧΛΉΒΉ, „НЕ
ΔΕΒΕΛ ЖЕ Η ΤΒΡΉΔΉ, ΙΑΚΟ ΔΑ НЕ ΠΗΡΑΖΥΤΕ ΣΧΟΜΣ ΠΗΨΕ ΜΛΑΔΥΧΉ
ΜΕΚΉΚΟΕ Η ΝΕΩΒΟΥΧΕΝΝΟ, ΝΉ ΣΒΟΗΜΗ ΖΟΥΒΥ ΣΔΡΟΒΥΒΨΗ, ΣΜΉΡΝΟ ЖЕ Η *
ΠΟΔ(Ο)ΒΝΟ ΣΙΛΟЮ ΠΡΗΝΟΣΕΨΑГО* ΣΤΨΟΡΗ;

* ЖЕ Η Ch,N : ЖЕ om. R,Z,B

* Gr. passive voice, τοῦ προσφερομένου, (= the child); Sl. active voice, ΠΡΗΝΟΣΕΨΑГО, probably secondary reading for passive ΠΡΗΝΟΣΕΨΑГОСЕ

Since the Greek fragment as a whole exhibits a marked stylistic pattern, e.g. the recurring doublets of near synonyms, our first delineation of the unit to be compared is the complete sentence. We notice that the three-part parallelism disappears completely in the Exarch's translation (сочха, единако не оутврѣдивъша сѧ, Ѹ). He has also altered the information sequence: the two members of the antithesis (οὐ... ἀλλὰ), separated in the source text by the negative final clause, are brought together (не... нъ). We can farther define three smaller units for comparison:

a. ὀδοντοφουῶντι... ἀκατέργαστον / Δ ΛΚΟ... схха: the participial indirect object ὀδοντοφουῶντι δὲ ἤδη καὶ αὐξανομένῳ is reduced to the adverbial clause Δ ΛΚΟ ωζουβατѣть, ἤδη and καὶ αὐξανομένῳ are omitted as redundant. Another reduction, though rather a stylistic than a semantic one, is οὐ τραχύν τε καὶ ἀκατέργαστον to не сохха.

b. ὥς ἂν μὴ... ἀγύμναστον / ΔΑ ΕΜΟΥ НЕ... оутврѣдивъшу сѧ: in John's negative final clause, the active voice replaces the passive voice of the Greek, the implicit subject being [χλѣβъ сочхъ], to be compared with the Greek abstract agent, a nominalised adjective + adnominal genitive, τῷ σκληρῷ τῆς τροφῆς. The phrase can be considered as a metonym (the quality /abstract noun/ instead of the thing /adnominal genitive/) that has not been retained in translation. The same can be said of the subject of the Greek passive, again a nominalised adjective + adnominal genitive, τὸ τῶν οὐλῶν ἀπαλόν τε καὶ ἀγύμναστον, replaced by the concrete term ДЯСНЪ and supplemented with a participle to account for the meaning of the Greek adjectives, единако не оутврѣдивъша сѧ.

c. ἀλλὰ... ἐποίησεν / нъ... сзживаюци: the Greek clause was heavily reduced, in size, rank and explicitness, to the conjunct participle нъ сѧ сзживаюци. Again we notice an inclination towards reduction.

In the *anonymus*' translation the three-part parallelism has been preserved (ДЕВΕΛ ЖЕ Η ΤΒΡΉΔΉ, ΜΕΚΉΚΟΕ Η ΝΕΩΒΟΥΧΕΝΝΟ, ΣΜΉΡΝΟ ЖЕ Η ΠΟΔ(Ο)ΒΝΟ), though part of the assonance and rhythm of the original has been lost. The metonyms are also preserved (схχομς пѣсе, младѣхъ мекѣкоє η нѣωβουχєннє). It is not clear, however, if this retrieval of the Greek rhetoric is a conscious effort to borrow the style of the fragment as a whole, or just the by-product of a persistent pursuit of formal congruence. The anonymous

translator's penchant towards the use of morphological calques is clearly felt here: ἁ-γύμναστον – не-ωβουχєнно, σύμ-μετρόν – съ-мѣрно, τοῦ προσ-φερομένου – прѣ-носѣицаго<сє>.

εἶτα κατὰ προσθήκην τῆς δυνάμεως ἐπιδιδούσης, προσεθισθὲν τοῖς ἀπαλωτέροις ἡρέμα τὸ νήπιον προσάγει τῇ στερεωτέρᾳ τροφῇ*.

and then as its power increases by growth she gradually leads on the babe, accustomed to tender food, to more solid nourishment;

* τῷ νηπίῳ π. τὴν στερεωτέραν τροφήν *i*

Ex.: тако же силѣ прѣбываши и ωбзѣкзашу. отроцати макзкаиа ѣди ѣсти, по малѣ ωбучитѣ и и жестокзѣи хлѣбѣ ѣсти; юнотѣ же бзѣкзашю емоу и зѣло жестокзю емоу* ѣдѣ длетѣ емоу* ѣсти –

und so, nachdem die Kraft zugenommen hat und das Kind (nunmehr) gewohnt geworden ist, weiche Speisen zu essen, es langsam (daran) gewöhnt, auch hartes Brot zu essen; nachdem es aber zum Jüngling geworden, ihm auch sehr harte Nahrung zu essen gibt –

* ein *emu* ist zu streichen.

AN.: таже по прѣложенїѣ силѣ прѣдавающѣи, ωобычавшѣсе мѣккымѣ помалѣ младеицѣ прѣноситѣ тврѣдѣишю пицѣ.

Again, John's translation of this fragment must be considered as a whole, as one solution to the translational problem posed by the source text sentence. The Greek *anaphora* (προσ-, προσ-, προσ-) is not retained, but compensated. κατὰ προσθήκην is left implicit. The Greek participial constructions (the *genitivus absolutus*, τῆς δυνάμεως ἐπιδιδούσης, and the conjunct participle προσεθισθὲν) are both translated by a *dativus absolutus*, forming a *chiasmus* (subject – part. / part. – subject). While προσεθισθὲν is complemented by a dative object (τοῖς ἀπαλωτέροις), the Exarch more explicitly complements ωбзѣкзашу with an infinitive clause (макзкаиа ѣди ѣсти). On stylistic grounds, John translates προσάγει τῇ στερεωτέρᾳ τροφῇ by ωбучитѣ и и жестокзѣи хлѣбѣ ѣсти. He does not reduce his original here, but turns to *amplificatio*: another *dativus absolutus* is added. He hereby creates assonance in the three participles (прѣбываши, ωбзѣкзашу, бзѣкзашю). The addition (юнотѣ... ѣсти) enables John to create a three-part structure with *epiphora* (ѣсти, ѣсти, ѣсти) and recurring stem (ѣд/ѣс).

In the 14th century translation, the prevalence of word-level congruence is clear once more. The *anonymus*' liking for calques results in the preservation, at least partially, of the repetition of the prefix (προσ-θήκην, прѣ-ложєнїѣ; προσ-άγει, прѣ-носитѣ).

οὕτω τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην μικροψυχίαν ὁ Κύριος οἶόν τι νήπιον ἀτελὲς διὰ τῶν θαυμάτων τρέφων καὶ τιθηνούμενος, πρῶτον μὲν ἐν ἀπεγνωσμένη νόσῳ τὴν τῆς ἀναστάσεως προοιμιάζεται δύναμιν, ὃ μέγα μὲν ἦν τῷ κατορθώματι, οὐ μὴν τοιοῦτον οἶον ἀπιστεῖσθαι λεγόμενον·

so the Lord, nourishing and fostering with miracles the weakness of the human mind, like some babe not fully grown, makes first of all a prelude of the power of the resurrection in the case of a desperate disease, which prelude, though it was great in its achievement, yet was not such a thing that the statement of it would be disbelieved.

EX.: ТАКО ЖЕ И ЧЛВЧ(С)КОУЮ || ΧΟΥΔΟСТЬ Γ̄ ΙΑΚΟ И МЛАДЕНЬЦΙΑ ЧΟΥΔЕСЪ
 ДѢЛА И КРЪЗМѢ ПРЪВОЕ ВЪ ОΥΤΖΑΙΑΝΤЪ ЧЛВЦЪ ΙΑΖΕЮ ВЪСКРЪСЕННЮ
 ΠΡΟΤΒΑΡΙΑΕΤЪ СИЛОУ, ЕЖЕ ВЕΛΙΚΟ БѢШЕ ΟΥΙΟΡΑΒΛΕΝΙΕΜЪ (sic, instead of
 ΟΥΠΡΑΒΛΕΝΙΕΜЪ?), НЪ НЕ ТАКО ΑΚΟ ЖЕ НЕ ВЪΒΡΟΒΑΤΗ ΠΟΒ̄ΔΑΕΜΟΥ.
 (wie also eine Mutter so an ihrem Kind handelt), ebenso erweist auch der Herr,
 indem Er die menschliche Schwäche wie ein Kleines Kind durch (Seine) Wunder
 säugt und nährt, zuerst bei der durch Krankheit (verursachten) Verzweiflung eines
 Menschen die Macht der Auferstehung, was (zwar) als Heilseinrichtung etwas
 Großes (wörtl.: groß) war, aber nicht so (groß), daß das Erzählte nicht zu glauben
 (wäre).

AN.: СНЦЕ ЧЛ(ОВѢ)ЧЬСКОЕ МАЛОД(ΟΥ)ШІЕ Γ(Ο)ΠΟΔ)Β, ΙΑΚΟЖЕ НѢКОЕГО
 ΜΑΔΔ̄ΒΝЦΑ ΝΕΣΒΡΥШЕНΑ, ЧЮДЕСМЫ ΠΗΤΑΕ И ΔΟΕ, ΠΡ̄Β̄ЖДЕ ΟΥΒΟ ВЪ
 ΟΥΑΔΑΝΝΟΜЪ НЕΔΟΥΖЪ ВЪСКР(Ъ)СЕНІА ΠΡΟΜΒΡΑЖАΕΤЪ СІΛΣ, ЕЖЕ ВЕΛΙΚΟ ΟΥΒΟ Б̄
 НΠΡΑΒΛΕΝІΕΜЪ, ΝΕ 8ΒΟ f.159^r || ТАКОВО ΙΑΚΟΒΟ* ΝΕΒ̄ΒΡΟΒΑΤΗCΕ ΓΛ(Δ)ΓΟΛ)ΕΜΟ.

* ΙΑΚΟΒΟ Ch,N : ΙΑΚΟ R,Z,B

This passage indicates that sometimes the Exarch also translates on the level of words or smaller lexical units. With a few exceptions, words can be considered here as ‘replaced’ and ‘replacing’ segments of the source text and the target text. However, some details reveal the different approaches of both translators, e.g. John’s addition or omission of particles (же, μέν), and the implied ἀτελής. The change of one phrase towards a more explicit and concrete diction can be noticed: ВЪ ОΥΤΖΑΙΑΝΤЪ ЧЛВЦЪ ΙΑΖΕЮ for ἐν ἀπεγνωσμένη νόσῳ. Farther there is a shift from passive to active voice: ἀπιστεῖσθαι λεγόμενον – НЕ ВЪΒΡΟΒΑΤΗ ΠΟΒ̄ΔΑΕΜΟΥ (compare the *anonymus*’ translation ΝΕΒ̄ΒΡΟΒΑΤΗCΕ ΓΛ(Δ)ΓΟΛ)ΕΜΟ).

Once more, the 14th century translation falls back on morphological calques: МАЛО-Д(ΟΥ)ШІЕ (compare ΧΟΥΔΟСТЬ) for μικρο-ψυχίαν and ΝΕ-СΒΡΥШЕНΑ for ἀ-τελής.

It is clear that the Exarch’s translation exhibits all kinds of ‘translational shifts’. John uses a variety of strategies to produce a target text that “*resembles the original in a way which is relevant to [his] aim (...) and the needs and cognitive environment of the reader*”⁷⁶. Following Chesterman’s classification⁷⁷, we can say that he uses a wide range of syntactic translation strategies, such as

⁷⁶ CHESTERMAN, *Memes*: 35.

⁷⁷ CHESTERMAN, *Memes*: 94-112.

transposition, or change of word class (G3), unit shift⁷⁸ (G4), phrase, clause and sentence structure change (G5-7), cohesion change⁷⁹ (G8) and rhetorical scheme change (G10). He rarely turns to literal translation (G1). Some of his *semantic* strategies are abstraction change (S5), distribution change (expansion and compression) (S6), trope change (S9), and other modulations of various kinds (S10). *Pragmatic* strategies are also important, especially the explicitness change (Pr2) and, to a lesser degree, the information change (Pr3) and coherence change⁸⁰ (Pr6).

The only strategies described by Chesterman that apply to the 14th century translation are the literal translation (G1) and loan or calque (G2). Nevertheless, one could assume a major ‘shift’ in this translation, notably the one described by Popović: “*All that (...) fails to appear where it might have been expected*”⁸¹, i.e. on target language grounds. It is true that the anonymous translator does not make many concessions in favour of the target language. However, the radical borrowing of source language elements had probably lost its ‘foreignising’ character by the time the *De hominis opificio* was translated, and most of these elements adopted functions in the target language similar to their functions in the source language.

One of the most remarkable differences between both translations seems to be the ‘unit of translation’, a notion not as unambiguous as it may seem.

“Considered from a process-oriented point of view, the unit of translation is the stretch of source text on which the translator focuses attention in order to represent it as a whole in the target language (Lörscher 1993: 209).”⁸²

However, the mental processes that occur during translation remain unknown to us, so we can only rely on the product:

“Considered from a product-oriented point of view, the unit of translation is the target-text unit that can be mapped onto a source-text unit.”⁸³

⁷⁸ The word is borrowed from Catford. The units are: morpheme, word, phrase, clause, sentence, paragraph. CHESTERMAN, *o.c.*: 97.

⁷⁹ “*something that affects intra-textual reference, ellipsis, substitution, pronominalization and repetition, or the use of connectors of various kinds.*” *Ibid.*: 98.

⁸⁰ “*Whereas the cohesion change strategy listed under G8 has to do with formal markers of textual cohesion, coherence changes have to do with the logical arrangement of information.*” *Ibid.*: 111.

⁸¹ POPOVIČ, *Concept*: 79.

⁸² MALMKJAER, “Unit of translation”, *RETS*: 286. Not to be identified, as by Catford, with translation equivalent. Different kinds of ‘equivalence’ (formal, connotational, functional) can exist on different levels (structure, meaning, function) and on different ranks (morpheme, word, clause, sentence).

⁸³ MALMKJAER, *o.c.*: 286.

Contrary to what we would expect from his preface⁸⁴, the Exarch does not confine himself to the lower grammatical levels. His ‘unit of translation’ seems to move up and down the scale of grammatical ranks, so that we can apply Catford’s term ‘unbounded translation’ to John’s work⁸⁵. The *anonymus*, however, apparently tries to segment the source text into individual words or small word groups and to render those segments one at a time. This approach comes close to what Catford called a ‘rank-bound translation’, where the unit of translation seems largely confined to one or a few ranks, low in the hierarchy of grammatical units (words, but also morphemes and phrases)⁸⁶.

To conclude

Scholars have always tried to establish the deeper motives for different translational approaches. Foreignising translations have been called instruments for cultural innovation⁸⁷, while domesticating strategies have been considered a form of (imperialist or evangelical) conquest⁸⁸.

Other frequently mentioned factors are the prestige of the source language, the fear of heresy, the respect for a sacred source text, etc. Though we can assume that both John and the *anonymus* respected their source texts and tried to avoid deviation from the truth they carried, the general idea of what constitutes an appropriate translation had changed. In this respect, the case is illustrative for the history of *the concept* of translation, as much as for the history of actual translational practices.

Nida once remarked: “*When the question of the superiority of one translation over another is raised, the answer should be looked for in the answer to another question, ‘Best for whom?’*.” This brings us back to the quotation from St. Paul, 1Cor.3:2⁸⁹, a food metaphor similar to that used by Gregory. Maybe we cannot say that the Exarch, in his translation of chapters 25-27 of the *De hominis opificio*, was giving ‘milk’ to his neophyte audience, but he certainly, “*ѣкоже бо и мѣти*”, softened the ‘food’ by his translation, making it ‘suitable and convenient for the powers of the eater’. The *anonymus*’ more erudite audience, on the other hand, tolerated ‘more solid nourishment’, like an older child, whose mother “*и зѣло жестокоу ю емоу ѣдъ даеть ѣсти*”.

⁸⁴ See *supra*, notes 66 and 67.

⁸⁵ although Catford defines the notion ‘unit of translation’ somewhat differently, as pointed out in note 82. CATFORD, *Linguistic Theory*: 24-26.

⁸⁶ *Ibidem*.

⁸⁷ VENUTI, “Strategies of translation”, *RETS*: 242.

⁸⁸ VENUTI, *o.c.*: 241, and NIDA, who considers domestication a tool that efficiently assist the missionary, “Bible translation”, *RETS*: 22-28.

⁸⁹ already used by THOMSON in a similar context, *Continuity*: 143.

In conclusion, we wish to remark that, if a norm-based approach to translation description is to be effective, we have to move away from the treatment of translated texts as isolated elements, and set ourselves to the examination of larger corpora. The establishment of intertextual and intra- and intersystemic relations will contribute to our understanding of the specific norms that govern the production and reception of translations in a given context. In this respect the present publication does not come up to the mark, and can only be considered as a point of departure.

Lara SELS
Universiteit Gent

LITERATURE CITED

- ÅGREN, I., *On the problem of using printed editions of greek texts for studying old slavonic translations. With the example of the slavonic translation of Ephrem the Syrian's Paraenesis* (= *Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Slavica Upsaliensia* 31). Stockholm 1991.
- BAKER, M. (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London 1998 (= *RETS*).
- , "Norms", *RETS*: 163-165.
- BAKKER, M., KOSTER, C., VAN LEUVEN-ZWART, K., "Shifts of translation", *RETS*: 226-231.
- BARKHUDAROV, L., "The problem of the unit of translation", *Translation as Social Action. Russian and Bulgarian Perspectives* (ed. P. ZLATEVA): 39-46.
- CANEVET, M., "Saint Grégoire de Nyse", *Dictionnaire de la spiritualité*, Bd. 6 (Paris 1967): 971-1012.
- CATFORD, J.C., *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London 1965.
- CHESTERMAN, A., *Memes of Translation. The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory* (= *Benjamins Translation Library*, vol. 22). Amsterdam – Philadelphia, 1997.
- DÖRRIE, H., "Gregor III (Gregor von Nyssa)", *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, Bd. 12 (Stuttgart 1983): 863-895.
- EVEN-ZOHAR, "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem", *Literature and Translation. New Perspectives in Literary Studies* (eds. J. Holmes, J. Lambert, R. Van Den Broeck). Leuven 1978: 117-127.
- , "Polysystem Theory", *Poetics Today* 1 (1979): 287-310.
- FAWCETT, P., "Linguistic approaches", *RETS*: 120-125.
- FINE, J., *The Late Medieval Balkans. A Critical Survey from the Late Twelfth Century to the Ottoman Conquest*. Ann Arbor 2000 (1987).
- FORBES, G.H., "De Conditione Hominis", *Sancti patris nostri Gregorii Nysseni Basilii Magni fratris quae supersunt omnia*. t.1. Burntisland 1855: 96-319.
- FRANKLIN, S., *Writing, Society and Culture in Early Rus, c. 950-1300*. Cambridge 2002.
- GEERARD, M., *Clavis patrum graecorum* vol. II, *Ab Athanasio ad Chrysostomum*. Turnhout 1974. (= *CPG*)
- GEERARD, M. et NORET, J., *Clavis patrum graecorum. Supplementum*. Turnhout 1998.
- GOLDBLATT, H., "On the theory of textual restoration among the Balkan Slavs in the late middle ages", *Ricerche Slavistiche* 27-28 (1980-1981): 123-156.
- *Orthography and Orthodoxy. Constantine Kostenečki's Treatise on the Letters* (= *Studia Historica et Philologica* XVI), Firenze 1987.
- HANSACK, E., "Das Kyrillisch-Mazedonische Blatt und der Prolog zum Bogoslovie des Exarchen Johannes", *Die Welt der Slaven* 31 (1986), 2: 336-414.
- HEPPEL, M., "The Hesychast Movement in Bulgaria: The Turnovo School and its Relations with Constantinople", *Eastern Churches Review* 7 (1975): 9-20.
- KENNY, D., "Equivalence", *RETS*: 77-80.
- LÄGREID, A., *Der Rhetorische Stil im Šestodnev des Exarchen Johannes* (= *Monumenta linguae slavicae dialecti veteris* 4). Wiesbaden 1965.
- LAMBERT, J. – VAN GORP, H., "On describing Translations", *The Manipulation of Literature* (Hermans, T. ed.). London, 1985: 42-53.
- MALMKJAER, K., "Unit of translation", *RETS*: 286-288.
- MASON, I., "Communicative / functional approaches", *RETS*: 29-33.
- MOORE, W. – WILSON, H.A., *Select Writings and letters of Gregory, bishop of Nyssa* (= *A select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the christian Church. Second Series*, vol. V). Grand Rapids, Michigan 1994⁴ (Oxford, New York 1893).

- NIDA, E., "Bible translation", *RETS*: 22-28.
- NORD, C., *Translating as a Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester (?) 1997.
- OBOLENSKY, D., *The Byzantine Commonwealth*. London 2000 (1971).
- PODSKALSKY, *Theologische Literatur des Mittelalters in Bulgarien und Serbien 865-1459*. München 2000.
- POPOVIČ, A., "The Concept "Shift of Expression" in Translation Analysis", *The Nature of Translation*. The Hague – Paris, 1970: 78-87.
- ROBINSON, D., "Free translation", *RETS*: 87-90.
- ROTHER, H., "Sakrale Grundlagen der slavischen Literaturen", *Sakrale Grundlagen der slavischen Literaturen (= Vorträge und Abhandlungen zur Slavistik 43)*. München 2002.
- RUŽICKA, R., "Griechische Lehnsyntax im Altslavischen", *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 3 (1958): 173-185.
- SADNIK, L., *Des hl. Johannes von Damaskus Ἐκθεσις ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως in der Übersetzung des Exarchen Johannes*. 1, Wiesbaden 1967. 2-4, Freiburg i. Br. 1981-1984 (= *Monumenta linguae slavicae dialecti veteris. Fontes et dissertationes* 5, 14, 16, 17).
- , "Prikladi o vъstanii – Symbole für die Auferstehung", *Anzeiger für slavische Philologie* 9 (1977), 2: 247-254.
- , "Die Bruchstücke aus Väterschriften im Anschluß an die Übersetzung der Ἐκθεσις ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως des Exarchen Johannes", in: *Anzeiger für slavische Philologie* 9 (1977), 2: 429-444; 10/11 (1979): 163-187; 12 (1981): 133-169.
- SCHÄFFNER, C., "Skopos theory", *RETS*: 235-238.
- SELS, L., "La traduction slavonne du *De hominis opificio* de Grégoire de Nysse. Édition du prooemium et étude de la technique de traduction", *Slavica Gandensia* 28 (2001): 145-177.
- "Deux traductions slavonnes du *De hominis opificio* de Grégoire de Nysse (Xe et XIVe ss.)", *Slavica Gandensia* 29 (2002): 137-164.
- THOMSON, F.J., "Sensus or Proprietas Verborum. Mediaeval Theories of Translations as Exemplified by Translations from Greek into Latin and Slavonic", *Symposium Methodianum. Beiträge der Internationalen Tagung in Regensburg (17. bis 24. April 1985) zum Gedenken an den 1000. Todestag des hl. Method* (éd. K. Trost, E. Völkl, E. Wedel) (= *Selecta Slavica* 13). Neuried 1988: 675-691.
- , "Continuity in the Development of Bulgarian Culture During the Period of Byzantine Hegemony and the Slavonic Translations of Works by the Three Cappadocian Fathers", *Bălgarska Patriaršija. Cărkovnoistoričeski i archiven institut pri Bălgarskata Patriaršija duchovna adademija 'Sv. Kliment Ochridski'. Meždunaroden simpozium. 1100 godini ot blaženata končina na Sv. Metodij*. t.2 (Sofija 1998):140-153.
- , "John the Exarch's Theological Education and Proficiency in Greek as Revealed by his abridged translation of John of Damascus' «De Fide Orthodoxa»", *Palaeobulgarica – Starobălgaristika* 15 (1991), 1: 35-58.
- , "L'évolution de la manière de traduire chez les slaves au Moyen Age. Comparaison et édition de deux traductions slavonnes (Xe-XIVe siècles) de passages d'Irénée et d'un pseudo-Augustin", *Revue d'histoire des Textes* 24 (1994): 313-336.
- TOMSÂN, F. (= THOMSON), "Sravnjavane na slavjanski prevodi s nekritični izdanija na grăcki tekstove – njakolko primera za metodologičeska greška", *Kirilo-Metodievski Studii*, kn. 3 (1986): 289-294.

- TOURY, G., "The Nature and Role of Norms in Literary Translation", *Literature and Translation. New Perspectives in Literary Studies* (eds. J. Holmes, J. Lambert, R. Van Den Broeck). Leuven 1978: 83-100.
- , "A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies", *The Manipulation of Literature* (Hermans, T. ed.). London, 1985: 16-41.
- , *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond* (= *Benjamins Translation Library* 4). Amsterdam – Philadelphia, 1995.
- TROST, K., *Untersuchungen zur Übersetzungstheorie und -praxis des späteren Kirchenslavischen. Die Abstracta in der Hexaameronübersetzung des Zagreber Zbornik von 1469* (= *Forum Slavicum* 43). München 1978.
- VAN DEN BROECK, R. – LEFEVERE, A., *Uitnodiging tot de vertaalwetenschap*. Muiderberg, 1979.
- WEITEMEIER, B., "Latin Adaptation and German Translation: the Late Medieval German D-Translation of the *Visiones Georgii* and Its Source Text", *The Medieval Translator. Traduire au Moyen Age. Proceedings of the International Conference of Conques. Actes du Colloque international de Conques*. (26-29 July/juillet 1993): 99-119.
- VAN DEN BROEK, R., "The Concept of Equivalence in Translation Theory: some Critical Reflections", *Literature and Translation. New Perspectives in Literary Studies* (eds. J. Holmes, J. Lambert, R. Van Den Broeck). Leuven 1978: 29-47.
- VEČERKA, R., "The influence of Greek on Old Church Slavonic", *Byzantinoslavica* 63 (1997), 2: 363-386.
- VENUTI, L., "Strategies of translation", *RETS*: 240-244.
- WHITE, I., "Hesychasm and the Revival of Bulgarian Literature in the Fourteenth Century", *Bulgaria past and present. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Bulgarian Studies Held at the University of Wisconsin, Madison – May 3-5, 1973* (Ed. T. BUTLER). Columbus – Ohio 1976: 249-254.