Double Translations as a Characteristic Feature of the Old Church Slavonic Translation of John Chrysostom’s Commentaries on Acts

Introduction

The New Testament book Acts of the Apostles, although part of the Church life throughout Eastertide, was apparently “seldom preached upon”\(^1\). John Chrysostom’s series Homiliae 55 in Acta apostolorum (CPG 4426) is one of the very few extant commentaries on this New Testament book, and it is by far the most important among them. Chrysostom’s homilies on Acts have come down to us in more than 100 complete or partial copies, according to Pinakes\(^2\) – a testimony to their popularity in Byzantium. The homilies had an ancient Armenian version dating from 1077, apart from various epitomes and fragments in the catenae\(^3\), but it is unclear whether there existed an Armenian translation earlier than 1077\(^4\). Even though some commentators suggested that the 11\(^{th}\) century translation

---


\(^2\) http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/ [1 VIII 2019].

\(^3\) Some more information on the Armenian catenae see in: R.V. CHETANIAN, La version arménienne ancienne des “Homélies sur les Actes des Apôtres” de Jean Chrysostome. Homélies I, II, VII, VIII, Leuven 2004 [= CSCO.SA, 27–28], p. XX–XXXII. Rose V. CHETANIAN, the editor and translator of the Armenian versions of homilies 1, 2, 7, and 8, presents a rather fuzzy picture: Other than many fragments in catenae, the original text is presented in two manuscripts, one of them containing a complete translation done in 1077 from the Greek (ibidem, p. VII). This translation was revised in the 12\(^{th}\)–13\(^{th}\) century, ibidem, p. XXXVIII–XL.

\(^4\) An undated Armenian translation is mentioned in CPG 4426. At the beginning of her survey, R.V. Chétanian states: La question qui se pose est de savoir si ces épitomés ont été faits à partir des tradictions arméniennes ou s’ils reproduisent des épitomés grecs qui existaient déjà; si tel est le cas, il
replaced an earlier one that was lost, there is no firm evidence in this respect. The currently available data do not support the assumption that other ancient translations of John Chrysostom’s homilies on Acts existed before the 10th century, apart from an early Latin translation which is now lost. Such being the case, the earliest preserved non-Greek version of these homilies is the Old Church Slavonic translation originating from the city of Preslav in the first quarter of the 10th century.

Chrysostom’s Commentaries on Acts in the Zlatostruy Collection

The Old Church Slavonic translation of the Chrysostomian series is not complete and, unlike the 11th-century Armenian version, it is not reliable as regards the Greek text. Not only is it selective and partial, but also it does not always correspond to the known Greek text. I will address some of these issues below.

At least 18 (out of 55) homilies on Acts were translated into Old Church Slavonic, namely the ethica of homilies 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 12, 18, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 34, 36, 44, 45 and fragments from homilies 37, 45 and 48. The translated texts were included in the renown Chrysorrhoas collection (Zlatostruy) as individual homilies or as part of compilations. Considering the fact that the circulation of these homilies in the medieval Slavonic world was closely entwined with Zlatostruy, some features of the entire collection are particularly relevant to our understanding of the individual texts on Acts:

1. The Zlatostruy collection is preserved only in late copies (mostly from 14th–15th century onwards). All of them attest to later stages of the text history with secondary changes such as revisions, omissions, additions, etc.
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2. There are several versions of Zlatostruy, most notably the Longer (L) and the Shorter Zlatostruy (S) with 138 and 81 homilies respectively. They have 62 homilies in common, L is more faithful to the Greek sources (and presumably to the initial translation), but S is preserved in the oldest copy – a 12th century manuscript from the Russian National Library in Saint Petersburg, Fн.1.46⁹.

3. The original translation was made in the first quarter of the 10th century in Preslav as a project initiated and supervised by the Bulgarian Tsar Symeon (893–927). Although no manuscript from this time-period has survived, the later copies are considered relatively reliable in respect of the original translation, especially the first 45 homilies of the longer version L¹⁰.

4. The homilies in the Zlatostruy collection were translated by more than one translator (and most probably by more than two) – the homilies differ in terms of principles of translation, usage of concurring means of expression, and vocabulary¹¹. We can cautiously suggest, that the Bulgarian compilers and translators selected the texts from numerous manuscripts containing John Chrysostom’s works and divided them between each other.

In this context the Commentaries on Acts occupy an important place in Zlatostruy. With partial translations of 18 homilies – ethica and fragments – it is the best represented homiletical series in the Old Bulgarian collection (other Old Church Slavonic homilies selected from Chrysostom’s commentaries include e.g. 17 homilies on the First Epistle to Corinthians, 10 homilies on the Epistle to Romans, 7 on the Gospel of Matthew, etc.). All but one of the translated homilies on Acts are included in L (four homilies in the first part L1–45, the others in the second part L46–137), and all of them are present in the other Zlatostruy versions (the longer L, the shorter S, the Hilandar version, and others). It allows us to make the safe assumption that these homilies were part of the original collection – the one translated and compiled in the early 10th century Preslav before the additions and revisions characteristic for the later stages of formation of the collection¹².

---

⁹ None of the manuscripts of L is edited, S has several editions, the earliest copy from the 12th century is edited in Т. Георгиева, Златоструй от XII век, Силистра 2003.

¹⁰ There are many pieces of evidence to the time and place of the translation, the most compelling being the original preface, where Tsar Symeon is mentioned, cf. Я. Милтенов, Златоструй..., p. 7–12; А. Димитрова, Златоструят..., p. 9–10. Some of the manuscripts with fewer scribal errors and deviations from Greek date from the 15th century and contain only the first 45 homilies of L, e.g. Russian Academy of Sciences, Saint Petersburg, MS No 33.2.12, Russian State History Museum, Moscow, collection of the Chudov monastery, MS No 214, and others. More on the manuscripts see in Я. Милтенов, Златоструй..., p. 21–28.

¹¹ А. Димитрова, Преводачески подходи в сборника Златоструй (Златоустовите коментари върху 1Кор.), [in:] Кирило-Методиевски четения 2015. Юбилеен сборник, ed. А.-М. Тотоманова, Д. Атанасова, София 2015, p. 18–32.

¹² This complicated issue is well clarified in Я. Милтенов, Златоструй: старобългарски хомилетичен свод..., p. 73–82.
On the other hand, the Slavonic translation of the Commentaries on Acts differs from the other homilies in Zlatostruy. There are many discrepancies between the Slavonic texts and their Greek counterparts, explanatory and expanded renditions of some phrases and passages are very common, and in some cases, the abridgements and transformations are so big that the Greek source is unrecognisable. There are two possible explanations of this incongruity: 1. the medieval Bulgarian translators had at their disposal a manuscript with a very different Greek recension of Chrysostom’s homilies on Acts that did not coincide with either the “rough” or the “smooth” recensions we know today; 2. all the selected homilies on Acts had only one Slavonic translator (or perhaps two – a “radical” and a more “conservative” one), and the discrepancies come down to the translator’s free approach to the original. The evidence is not convincing enough to support either of these explanations, but one specific type of deviations of the Slavonic translation from the Greek source is particularly interesting – the double translations.

Double translations

The term “double translation” (doublet, Doppelübersetzung) denotes the technique where one word from the source text is rendered with two words in the translation. It allows keeping the equivalence between the source and the target language both in terms of form and sense, hence it is considered a method of literal translation. The researchers give two main explanations of the phenomenon – when marginal notes and glosses were incorporated into the main text, or when the translator used two words for emphasis and clarity. The double translations are a widely used method across various time-periods and languages – there are examples in the Septuagint, in medieval translations, in the oriental traditions, as well as in translations into modern languages. In the medieval Slavonic literature
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the most prominent author and translator known for his extensive use of double translations is John the Exarch. This linguistic device is so typical of his work that it helped identify and ascribe the anonymous translation of Chrysostom’s *Vita* to John the Exarch himself or someone from his circle in the first decades of the 10th century. However, double translations are not unique to this particular author from the Preslav literary school. They are present in other Slavonic translations as well, e.g. in the so-called *Nomokanon* of Methodius from the 9th century, in the translation from Latin of the Gospel commentaries of Pope Gregory the Great in the 10th–11th century, and in the monk Isaiah’s translation of pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita in the 14th century, to name a few.

The *Zlatostruy* collection also belongs to this group of texts. The homilies are not linguistically uniform and they reveal varying styles of multiple translators, but most translations can be defined as free yet relatively accurate. As pointed out above, Greek words and phrases often have descriptive and explanatory Slavonic renderings, and double translations are only part of the verbal inequivalence in the collection. Six out of the 18 homilies on *Acts* included in the collection are not

---


suitable for a comparative study, because they deviate significantly from the available Greek texts either due to revisions or because of a different Greek original. Another two translations are fragmentary and are also not discussed here. In the remaining ten homilies, there are at least 90 instances of double translations (nouns, verbs, and adjectives only), some texts containing up to 24 examples. The examined homilies are the following:


Although all the homilies attest to the use of double translations, the examples are unevenly distributed among them. Homily S22 has by far the most instances (24), followed by L41 (17 instances), L86 (12), L12 (11), L40 (7), L90 (7),

---

18 This list of homilies follows their attestation in the longer Zlatostruy (L). The earliest and most accessible complete copy of L1–137 – manuscript No 43 from the Moscow Theological Academy, 1474 (cetera: MTA 43), is available at http://old.stsl.ru/manuscripts/medium.php?col=58&manuscript=043. Homily S22 is present in the shorter Zlatostruy (S) and its earliest copy from Saint Petersburg’s Public Library En.Ι. 46 (12th century) is edited in Т. ГЕОРГИЕВА, Златоствръ…, p. 104–110. All examples are cited after these two manuscripts. The Greek sources are cited according to their edition in vol. LX of Patrologia Graeca.
L102 (5), L88 (4), L104 (2), L42 (1). Few of them seem to be of secondary origin such as later scribal revisions or integrated glosses, e.g. this sentence from L41 containing two pairs of double translations, χαλκοτύπος ‘(copper)smith’ – ρατάρι κρυνιν and σφῦρα ‘hammer’ – κλαδινε: PG, vol. LX, col. 203 ώς χαλκοτύπος σφῦραν οὕτω βαρεῖαν καταφέρων / like the smith who lets fall such a heavy hammer20 – MTA 43, f. 256r ἀκε ρατάρι κρυνιν. κλαδινε. τολκ ταξικο να ῥανε κρύνιν. In this phrase there are many variant readings between the manuscripts, e.g. instead of ρατάρι κρυνιν (the mistake κρυνιν is also widely spread) one Hilandar manuscript21 has only κρυνιν, the 12th century copy of S – κονίνινι; instead of κλαδινε, there are variant readings κλαδινε, κλαδινε, even a correction to κλαδα, and S and the Hilandar manuscript have only κλατε. It is easy to suggest that the proto-Bulgarian word κρυνιν needed a more common clarifying synonym (ρατάρι), but it is more difficult to explain the asyndeton κλατε κλαδινε – κλατε is attested as early as Codex Suprasliensis, but κλαδινε is a rare and perhaps regional variant that may have joined the main text from the margins22.

Despite the fluctuation of some readings, most of the instances can be considered genuine, originating from the initial translation. In an attempt to prove this and to support the central proposition of this study – that double translations are a linguistic and stylistic device typical for the Slavonic translator of the homilies on Acts – I will examine in some detail nearly half of the examples. They constitute several types, although not all double translations can be easily ascribed to one of these groups.

1. Proper Doppelübersetzungen: one of the two translations renders the form (or etymology) and the other – the meaning of the Greek word.

Many examples meet this requirement perfectly, e.g.:

ἐκκλησία – L41 цръкꙑ рекъше съборъ, where съборъ ‘assembly’ is the etymological translation, and цръкꙑ ‘church’ conveys the usual meaning of ἐκκλησία in Christianity;

---

21 This manuscript, Hilandar 386, Serbian, 14th century, is a rare South Slavonic copy, considered a separate version of Zlatostruj, closer to S, cf. Кл. Иванова-Константинова, Неизвестна редакция на Златоструй в сръбски извод от XIII в., ЗИК 10, 1976, p. 89–107; Я. Милтенов, Златоструй... p. 137–154.
22 In addition to this example from Zlatostruj, the word κλαδινε is attested also twice in the Old Testament (3Reg 6, 7 and Is 41, 7) and in Cosma’s Oratio contra Bogomilos, cf. М. Тотоманова-Панева, Книги Царства в славянската хронографска традиция, София 2019 [= КМс, 27], p. 132.
φιλάνθρωπος – L42 φιλάνθρωπος is the formal equivalent, and 'merciful' – the semantic one;
άλγεω – L86 καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, καθαρός, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλάνθρωπος, δοκρίμα, μεριμνά, καθαρός, φιλά

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

αμοιρος ‘without share, bereft of’, here in the context of baptism – PG, vol. LX, col. 23 ἀμοιρος / departs this life with no portion in that grace23, i.e. unbaptized – the Slavonic translation in L102 has поганъ не премнага дара того with the periphrastic, albeit not entirely literal translation “who did not receive this gift”, and поганъ bearing the overall meaning ‘pagan, heathen’.

One example is particularly interesting and indicative. The Greek word ψυχή ‘soul’ has a simple and exact Slavonic match – душа, yet in the Zlatostruy homilies on Acts it is repeatedly rendered with double translations ‘soul and mind’, ‘soul and heart’ (душа и ми́лъ, душа и њтроба) in at least four different homilies. S22 has two instances:

PG, vol. LX, col. 39 Οὐδὲν πλοίου κλυδωνιζομένου διενήνοχεν ἡ τοῦ ἱερέως ψυχή / The soul of a Bishop is for the world like a vessel in a storm24 – F.п.I. 46, f. 44a нинула же душа нервновон вчела. нкет душа нервновон дду и душе;

PG, vol. LX, col. 42 ἐπεὶ τῇ λυπουμένῃ ψυχῇ καὶ παρενοχλεῖν δοκεῖ / to a sorrowful heart it seems even to be a trouble25 – F.п.I. 46, f. 46a а пеўальк дду и душу. дду сианет т о твгую творит.

Homily L90 is also consistent in this respect:

PG, vol. LX, col. 61 Ἀλλὰ ταύτης τῆς ἑρημίας πολλῷ τοῦ μακροθύμου ἡ ψυχή / But sweeter far than this solitude is the soul of the longsuffering26 – MTA 43, f. 458 гъ такаꙗ похстѣлꙗ слаꙗꙗν есть дуꙗ и дду трукѣлѧгаго мяка и кроткаго.

Double Translations as a Characteristic Feature of the Old Church Slavonic…

(later in the same passage ψυχή is rendered with υμъ at least two more times, the other double translation from this sentence – μακρόθυμος ‘long-suffering, patient’ кротъ  κъ трпѣлъ – is also repeated below).

The example from L41 is a repetition of the whole phrase:

PG, vol. LX, col. 202 Ταῦτα πάντα ἱκανά ἐστι διαναστῆσαι ψυχήν / All this is enough to arouse the soul27 – MTA 43, f. 255r και δεδοκά την έκκλησιν άνω η υμъ ουστακιν (ψυχή is rendered with υμъ at least once more below).

The double rendition of ψυχή in L86 is adapted to the context:

PG, vol. LX, col. 313 τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εὐρυχωτέραν ποιεῖ τὴν ψυχήν / It makes the soul more spacious than the heaven28 – MTA 43, f. 450r και σφριγάω την ψυχὴν και ή υμъ ουστροεις (followed by 2Cor 7, 2 καλεσμεν ο θ美味 μενε αύλια, where the idea of υμъ as a vessel is contextually more appropriate).

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

Although these examples are in perfect agreement with what E. Hansack refers to as “stylistic doublets”30, the translator’s pursuit of an accurate formal and semantic equivalence is not the only raison d’être of double translations. The Slavonic translation tends to explain and sometimes to adapt the Greek text to its audience and often does not adhere to the formal features of the original.

2. Complementary double translations: when the Greek word has a complex meaning or does not have a single Slavonic counterpart and the two translations complement one another.

Several examples belong to this type, e.g.:

σφριγάω ‘to be vigorous, in full health and strength’ – L12 ένε η ζωγραφος γλυκόν ‘to be young and lush’, where neither of the Slavonic words is an exact match to the Greek verb, but together they convey the meaning well;

29 Nevertheless, the Slavonic υμъ for ψυχή is attested in some of the earliest manuscripts, such as Clozianus and Suprasliensis, cf. Slovník jazyka staroslověnského. (Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae), vol. I–LII, ed. J. Kurz et al., Praha 1958–1997 (s.v. υμъ).
προσκυνέω ‘fall down and worship’ – L88 κλανυθει τα καὶ μολιτει τα with the same meaning;

παννυχίς ‘watching all night, vigil’ – L41 κωκταννη καὶ μολιτει ‘rising and prayer’
(in the same homily there is another – single – translation of παννυχίς as ουκνομίς, whereas in S22 the translation is descriptive – ουμίςτε εμφρακείτα καὶ μολιθμέ);
συναλίζομαι ‘come together’, literally ‘eat salt with’ – L102 ἵπτη καὶ πινή (a reference to Act 1, 4, the Old Church Slavonic translation of Acts has only ἵπτη).

This kind of double translations is indicative not of inaptitude, but rather of translator’s ingenuity. The careful wording of the Slavonic translation is evident in a passage about self-restraint in L12 (InAA hom. 34), where the words φιλοσοφία and φιλόσοφος are rendered several times with double translations. The question about the early Christian shift in the meaning of φιλοσοφία has been widely discussed in the past several decades31. A simplified outline of the meanings of this term in patristic literature, and in John Chrysostom in particular, can be presented as follows32: pagan philosophy (negative, inferior) – philosophy as a system of beliefs and practices – Christian doctrine (viewed as superior) – Christian way of life – ascetic (monastic) way of life – self-restraint and control – martyrdom (endurance in suffering). In the Zlatostruy collection ‘philosophy’ and its derivatives are mentioned many times, both in pagan and in Christian context.

Some of the most common Slavonic parallels are мѫδρολюбъ, любомѫдрьство, прѫмѫдрость, мѫдрость (‘wisdom’, ‘love of wisdom’) and even the untranslated Greek word φιλοσοφία in L8, but also кѫзѧрѯѧнѧнъ (‘temperance’) in L13, L25, L27. The double translations in L12 are unique to this homily and are part of a larger variety of solutions, e.g.:

φιλοσοφία κρѢπ̃ς и σъмълъгъ ‘strength and reason’, φιλόσοφος σъмълъгъ и мѫдрълъка сѫ ‘reasonable or self-restrained’, кѫзѧрѯѧнъ и кѫзѧрѯѧнъ сѫ

31 Here are some of the articles on this topic that were available to me, they provide a more extensive list of additional literature: G.J.M. Bartelink, “Philosie” et “philosophe” dans quelques œuvres de Jean Chrysostome, RAM 36, 1960, p. 486–492 (a continuation of G. Bardy’s previous research on this matter in the works of authors from Clement of Alexandria to Eusebius of Caesarea – G.J.M. Bartelink is focused on Chrysostom’s works in volumes XLVIII–L of PG); A. Guillaumont, [rec.:] Anne-Marie Malingrey. “Philosophia”. Étude d’un groupe de mots dans la littérature grecque, des préso- cratiques au IVe siècle après J.-C… – RHR 164, 2, 1963, p. 244–246 (a review article on A.-M. Malingrey’s doctoral thesis on the use of ‘philosophy’ from Pythagoras to John Chrysostom); J.L. Quentin, A propos de la traduction de ‘philosophia’ dans l’ ‘Adversus oppugnatores vitae monasticae’ de Saint Jean Chrysostome, RSR 61, 4, 1987, p. 187–197 (a reflection not only on the meaning of ‘philosophy’ in Chrysostom’s early work but also an emphasis on the ambiguous nature of the term – the author insists that this ambiguity should be preserved in translations).

'strong and self-restrained', крѣпъкъ 'strong', философѣвъ къ мнѣ хочу стѣрѣнъ 'to control in temperance'.

The translator's intent can be seen in the overall context:


Trans.: (The masters starve their dogs so that they be quick on the prey)… and the brute creatures indeed they teach to be temperate, while they let themselves sink down into the gluttony of the brutes and are more unreasonable than them. The thing is a riddle. “And how can a beast be reasonable or temperate?” But is it a small strength [of will] and reason, when a dog gnawed with hunger and suffering, after having caught a hare, does not eat the ready meal before him, but holds it in his mouth and waits for his master? Be ashamed of yourselves: teach your bellies to be as strong and temperate. You have no excuse. You can instruct and teach everything to an irrational creature, and you cannot teach it to yourselves, who are truly reasonable?

In this episode ‘philosophical’ means ‘temperate, self-restrained’ (close to ‘ascetic’, one of the Christian meanings of the word), but also ‘reasonable, wise’ (σοφός) because of the opposition ἄλογος/λογικός, animal/human in this context. The Slavonic complementary double translation of φιλοσοφία as ‘strength and reason’ delivers the idea both of strong will and wisdom, and this is maintained further with φιλόσοφος as ‘reasonable or self-restrained’ and ‘strong and self-restrained’. The repetitive consistency of the translation, on the one hand, and its flexible variety, on the other, bear evidence to the fact that double translations are a deliberate and skilful linguistic device and a characteristic feature of the style of the translator.

33 The English translation is based on Chrysostom, vol. II, p. 479, where the words in question are translated as ‘philosophy’, ‘philosophical’ etc. Here it is adapted to the Slavonic text.
3. **Synonyms**: the two words in the double translation are synonyms and convey the original meaning equally well.

The double translations in this group usually correspond to a single meaning of the Greek word, whereas the previous two types (proper and complementary double translations) cover at least two different meanings or nuances of a complex word. Usually, the Slavonic synonyms in these cases are not interchangeable, e.g. one of them could be a common word, and the other – an archaism or a dialectism, but sometimes it is difficult to explain why the translator chose to use two equal words instead of one. Some of the most typical examples are the following:

σιγή ‘silence’ – L41 

The second Slavonic word with the same meaning ‘silence, quietness’ is very rare, but not unique, cf. the verb ζωγράφη, also in a double translation of another Greek word in this homily:

ήσυχία ‘silence’ – L41, MTA 43, f. 254v ἐνὲς ὅς καὶ ζωγράφη 

There is another double translation of the same Greek word:

ήσυχία – L90, MTA 43, f. 457v 

It seems that the idea of ‘silence’ attracts the use of synonyms, although one word would have been enough, cf.:

σιγάω ‘keep quiet’ – S22 

σκυθρωπός ‘sad, gloomy’ is translated in L86 as 

The next examples show no obvious stratification between the synonyms, cf.:

θρήνος (θρήνων) ‘lament, dirge’ – L41 

πενία ‘poverty’ – L40 

καταφρονέω ‘look down upon, despise’ – L90 
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---

The use of synonyms as double translations adds to the stylistic and lexical richness of the Slavonic texts, but it may also point to hesitation and indecisiveness in the process of translating.

4. **Contextual synonyms**: the two Slavonic translations are an unlikely pair outside the context, but are a good match for the particular Greek text.

It is a matter of discussion whether some of the examples belong here, but this is an apprehension applicable to most classifications. Some instances provide an interesting insight into the translator’s work, where word choice is aimed at the Slavonic audience as much as it conveys the meaning of the Greek source.

In L41 στενωπός ‘narrow passage, alley’ is rendered as 

**PG** vol. LX, col. 204 Ἐκεῖνοι δι’ ἀνθρώπινον νόμον περιΐασιν ἐν κρυμῷ βοῶντες μεγάλα, καὶ διὰ τῶν στενωπῶν βαδίζοντες / [The night-watchers], by man’s law, go their rounds in the cold, shouting loudly, and **walking through lanes and alleys**35, MTA43, f. 256v Τη ο εγκακάσα ξακονα δήλα ι κολαξίην. χοδά έσει πούμα τρυπεμονής ζημνιού. ι εκείνωμε ηλιαν εκερπ’ στεγνα λαμρ’ ἀντανμ’(the whole phrase διὰ τῶν στενωπῶν βαδίζοντες is repeated);

**PG** vol. LX, col. 202 Ἄν διακύψῃς εἰς τὸν στενωπὸν, οὐκ άκουςι οὐδέ φωνής· ἀν ίδης εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, πάντας οδεις καθάπερ ἐν τάφῳ κειμένους / If thou (look out of window and) lean over into the street, thou wilt not hear even a sound; if thou look into the house, thou wilt see all lying as it were in a tomb36, MTA43, f. 256v ἀμε εκ σικνοισιν αν στεγνα <c>πολατς το η ευλαμμιν γίδα, ην ινευ τονω. δυε η σικνοισιν κ’ άνθρωπо εβον ε πολατς. το τσε ενεγμιν δκς κ’ γροεκε λεκαιμε. Although the second example is not a double translation and άνθρωπο could be a mistake instead of the correct *διανητ* I think it is no accident that the same words στρόγγυλα and άνθρωπο are used in this context.

The next examples are less controversial: the word βασίλειον (τὰ βασίλεια) ‘kingly dwelling, palace’ is rendered in two different homilies with similar double translations – in L40 as πολατημε η καλκελει and in S22 as κ’ πολατης κ’ καλάξικαν. Both solutions are contextually appropriate and suggest a single translator. The closest counterpart of βασίλειον in the earliest Slavonic literature is πολατης η γεραμα in Supr. 199, 2, no other double translation is attested37.

---

35 Chrysostom, vol. I, p. 380. It is interesting to point out, that the English translators also use a double translation here – ‘lanes and alleys’.

36 Chrysostom, vol. I, p. 378. In the English translation there is a note concerning the word στενωπός: the lanes or alleys in the quarters formed by intersection of the broad streets, ibidem, note y.
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Some of the other contextual synonyms are the following:

ἄλογον ‘speechless, without reason; animal’ – L12 ΚΟΝΣ ΝΙΑ ΑΕΥΣΤΟΥ ΝΙΑ ‘horse or another animal’ (the word means ‘horse’ in medieval and modern Greek, at least from 6th century onwards38, and the Slavonic translator was apparently aware of it);

ξένος ‘foreign; guest’ – L88 ΝΙΠΤ Α ΣΤΡΑΝΤΝ ‘destitute and foreign’ (it is clear that the translator adds some Christian nuances to the idea of hospitality – to welcome the stranger, who happens to be poor).

The last group of examples includes several related Greek words with consistent Slavonic double translations:

δόκιμος ‘trustworthy’ is rendered in S22 as ΝΙΚΟΥΣΚΥ Α ΣΛΑΒΨ ‘skilful and renowned’, and ἄδόκιμος ‘unsatisfactory, discredited’ – as ΝΙΚΟΥΣΚΥ Α ΝΕΣ- ΛΑΒΨ;

εὐδοκιμέω ‘to be of good repute, to be distinguished in’ in L40 is ΣΛΑΒΨ Α ΝΙΚΟΥΣΚΥ ΕΥΤΗ (‘to be renowned and skilful’).

The two Slavonic notions of ‘fame’ and ‘skill’ are not synonyms outside the context. These examples could also fit in the first two groups of double translations. On the one hand, their combined meanings depict the complex semantical structure of the Greek word, i.e. they are complementary to each other (group 2), and on the other, the Slavonic word ΣΛΑΒΨ is an etymological translation of the root -δοκ-, cf. δόξα ‘repute, glory’, whereas (ΝΙΚΟΥΣΚΥ) is a standard parallel to the Greek (ά)δόκιμος39 (group 1).

The classification of the double translations is not only an attempt to confine each example to a group – as it became apparent, some attributions can be disputed – but also to point out the variety in their structure and inner logic. The Old Church Slavonic translation of Chrysostom’s homilies on Acts is far from literal, sometimes it is pleonastic compared to the Greek source. Here the double translations are both a method to accurately convey the sense of the original and a stylistic device typical for the translator.

Consistency of translation and comparison with other Old Church Slavonic texts

E. Hansack considered the use of double translations a distinctive feature of the production of a single translator (John the Exarch) or a group of translators from his school. Evidence from other works reveals that this was a more broadly used,

38 See e.g. E.A. Sophocles, Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100), Leipzig 1914 (s.v. ἄλογος).
39 Cf. Řecko-staroslověnský index…, (s.v. ἀδόκιμος); Slovník jazyka staroslověnského… (s.v. ΝΙΚΟΥΣΚΥ).
but not ubiquitous linguistic method in all periods of Slavonic literacy. The presence of double translations may not be enough for identifying an anonymous translator, but it does distinguish certain (groups of) works as opposed to others. A more valid argument for identification is the consistency of translation, i.e. whether the translator uses the same combinations of doublets.

One of the best examples of multiple uses of the same double translation is the last instance cited above, where two different homilies (S22 and L40) have used three times the combination ἕκοψαν καὶ εὐλαβήνεῖ for δόκιμος and its derivatives. The same homilies have another doublet in common (not identical, but of the same root): τὰ βασιλεία ‘kingly dwelling, palace’ πολάτες καὶ εὐλαβεῖ γε L40, εἴ τι πολάτες εἴ τι εὐλαβεῖ S22. Some similarities can be traced also between S22, L41, and L90, e.g. the rendering of ψυχή as душа и υμα in all of them (and nowhere else) and the tendency to translate ‘silence’ using two words (σιγή and ησυχία in L41, ησυχία in L90, and σιγάω in S22 all have double translations, the examples are listed above). On the other hand, there are many variations, e.g. the doublets for ‘silence’ are not the same, παννυχίς has at least three different renderings in L41 and S22 (see above), and the interesting Greek verb ἔξιστημι ‘drive s.o. out of his senses; intr. be out of o. ’s wits’ is translated in L90 as εὔχεσθημι καὶ ἐκτίσθημι υμα (ἐκτίσθεν ἂν τῶν κατὰ φύσιν φρενῶν), and in S22 as υμα ἐποργικῆσθαι καὶ ἐπαρασκεύασθαι εἰα (οἱ ἐξεστηκότες). Variation does not necessarily mean independence of translations – sometimes there are as many as three different double translations of a Greek word in a single homily, cf. S22 σκανδαλίζειν ‘cause to stumble, lead into sin’, rendered as πρεκυργεῖν τεροτίνη καὶ κλαζήν ‘offend and deceive’, σιγάω σροδίσειν ἐξάεσται καὶ κλαζήν ‘there will be evil and deceit to the heart’, and πολαζακμῆσθαι καὶ κλαζακμῆσθαι εἰα ‘accusing and deceived’ (οἱ σκανδάλιζόμενοι).

The conformity between the double translations in S22, L40, L41, and L90 is by no means a matter of coincidence. It supports the assumption that these homilies were translated by a single Bulgarian translator who tended to explain and expand on the Greek original. This conclusion results in another important issue. Homily S22 is not present in the longer Zlatostruy (L), and L90 is from the second part of L (L46–L137), which was added to the first 45 homilies at a later stage. If they were produced by the same translator as the homilies from the first part of L (L40 and L41 and possibly some others), it is beyond doubt that all of them were part of the original Old Bulgarian collection Zlatostruy from the early 10th century. This is a solid argument in favour of the unity between the first part of L, its second part, and the shorter Zlatostruy (S).

The comparison with the translations of John the Exarch also yealds some noteworthy results. E. Hansack gives more than 200 examples of doublets from

---

40 See the literature in notes 16 and 17 above.
Exarch’s translations of Hexaemeron (Š.), De fide orthodoxa (Ekth.), and Vita Chrysostomi (V.Ch.)⁴¹. Some of them are close to the examples from Zlatostruy:

ὑμνεῖν – Š. χαλάνει καὶ πλακάνει⁴², L41 μοιλήν καὶ χαλάνει;

λόγος – Š. σκηνύσαλ τα κε λόγος⁴³, L12 ψυχαλ καὶ λυσαλ;

*ἀδυναμία – Ekth. υπομυθη καὶ λεκνοτη⁴⁴, ραθυμία – L102 λεκνοτη καὶ σαλεκτη;

*δεικνύναι – Š. εἰκοναθαν καὶ ποιοοθαν⁴⁵, εξηγεῖσθαι V.Ch. ψυχαλ εἰκοναθαν⁴⁶, ἐντιθεὶμι – L12 ποιοοθαν καὶ ποιοοθαν;

ἐπιθυμεῖν – V.Ch. χελατι καὶ χοτετη, χελατι καὶ χοτετη⁴⁷, S22 χελατι καὶ χελατι (ἐπιθυμία – χελατινε σαλοκνοε καὶ χελατινη);

πρόνοια – V.Ch. προμυθαλ καὶ στροφ, L40 προμυθαλ καὶ στροφ, L41 πευκαλ καὶ τροφῆ, καὶ προνοεῖν – V.Ch. πευκαλ εα κα κασπεντι⁴⁸.

The similarities, although too general, do not exclude a possible connection or mutual influence between the two groups of texts, which originate from the same area, time-period, and literary circles. However, the few concurring instances are not sufficient for positive identification of the anonymous translator of the homilies in Zlatostruy.

J. Reinhart gives another perspective to the topic⁴⁹. In his research on hendiadys as a stylistic device he finds ca. 30 parallels between the double renderings in the 10th–11th-century Slavonic translation from Latin of the homilies of Pope Gregory the Great (Bes.), and the Scripture (especially Psalms and Proverbs). He argues that some of the examples are direct stylistic and lexical borrowings, due to the exceptional influence of the Bible on medieval literature, although the phenomenon should not be overestimated⁵⁰. Few of them comply with the examples from the Zlatostruy collection, e.g.:

Bes. ad delectationem ἃ ἐράστης καὶ ἐν σάλης, καὶ ἀγαλλιάζεται, τερφθήσεται, Ps 34, 9 exsultare et delectari, Ps. Sin. εὐχαριστησε καὶ ἀγαλλιάζεται καὶ ἀγαλλιάζεται (LXX ἀγαλλιάζεται, τερφθήσεται), and Ps 67, 4 epulari et exsultare et delectari, Ps. Sin. εὐχαριστησε καὶ εὐχαριστησε.

---

⁴¹ E. Hansack, Zum Übersetzungsstil…, p. 138–171. E. Hansack claims that the overall number of the verified instances is five-time more, but he includes also pronouns, conjunctions, and particles, as well as many examples from parts of the text without Greek Vorlage.

⁴² Ibidem, p. 139.

⁴³ Ibidem, p. 145.

⁴⁴ Ibidem, p. 153. The example is without Greek, E. Hansack reconstructs *ἀδυναμία.

⁴⁵ Ibidem, p. 154. The example is without Greek, E. Hansack reconstructs *δεικνύναι.

⁴⁶ Ibidem, p. 155.


⁴⁸ Ibidem, p. 158, 162. The two variants from Zlatostruy are very suitable for their respective contexts.

⁴⁹ J. Reinhart, Une figure stylistique…, p. 597–606.

Double Translations as a Characteristic Feature of the Old Church Slavonic

сѧ, насладʼтʼ сѧ (LXX εὐφρανθήτωσαν, ἀγαλλιάσθωσαν, τερφθήτωσαν) – L86 ἣδονἠ σαλὰς ἡ ῥαδεςτ;

Bes. praedicare καζατι η σφωντι, cf. Ps 93, 12 erudire et docere, Ps Sin. наказати, науѓишка (LXX παιδεύσῃς, διδάξῃς) – L12 ἐντίθημι σφωντι и наказати (the same in Š. and V.Ch., see above).

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

Chrysostom’s commentaries on Acts are not the only texts in Zlatostruy with double translations. Some of the attested examples in the other homilies are the following: L2 ἀσινῆς σћдравъ и беꙁъ врѢда, ἐιδωλομανῆς φѢμъратъ и неꙁствоꙁъ, τὸν νόμον παιδεύσῃς, διδάξῃς – L12 ἐντίθημι σѢдравъ и накаꙁатъ (the same in Š. and V.Ch., see above).

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

Chrysostom’s commentaries on Acts are not the only texts in Zlatostruy with double translations. Some of the attested examples in the other homilies are the following: L2 ἀσινῆς σћдравъ и беѢда, ἐιδωλομανῆς φѢμъратъ и неꙁствоꙁъ, τὸν νόμον παιδεύσῃς, διδάξῃς – L12 ἐντίθημι σѢдравъ и накаꙁатъ (the same in Š. and V.Ch., see above).

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

Conclusions

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

51 Ibidem, p. 601, no. 16; Slovník jazyka staroslověnského… (s.v. радоканин).
52 J. Reinhartz, Une figure stylistique…, p. 601, no. 7.
53 Cf. V.Ch. διαβάλλω потѧꙃатъ рекъше клеветатъ, E. Hansack, Zum Übersetzungsstil…, p. 147, as well as S22 ои σκανδαλιζόμενοι ποτѧꙃαѭще и κρѢνѧ所所
54 Cf. V.Ch. αἵρεσις ἐρεσε рекъше ꙁъловѣρъ, E. Hansack, Zum Übersetzungsstil…, p. 141.
55 Cf. L41 χαλκοτύπος златарь и крѢɲи, mentioned above.
56 Some additional examples and commentary on the extensive and interesting vocabulary of the collection see in: А. ДИМИТРОВА, Златоструят…, p. 81–444.
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principles of literal translation and as a stylistic device aiming at synonymity and linguistic variety. On the one hand, they are a distinctive feature that defines the translator’s style and sets one group of texts apart from other Old Church Slavonic translations. On the other hand, the use of double translations in many different texts makes them part of a large and complex network of medieval intertextuality.

Double translations in the Old Church Slavonic translation of Chrysostom’s homilies on Acts (List)

ἀγρός – χλῆβες L41
ἀδόκιμος – нескичынъ S22
αιτία – къмъ начать и откъмът S22
ἀκίνδυνος – бѣлъ владѣлъ да къмъ са не волати S22
ἀκτίνες ἡλιακαί – сияють слънця сего и луку S22
ἀλγεω – жалѣтъ S86
ἀλογηθέω (ἀλογηθεῖς) – ѳмлътъ ѳсрамътъ сѧ L88
ἀναπίπτω – обумрѣтъ L40 / отънемощъ L41
ἀναπνέω – отъдѣхнѫтъ ѳстѣдѣтъ сѧ L41
ἀνίατος – бѣда прѣблѣнъ L86
ἀνίσταμαι, ἀνακτάομαι – въстатъ, въꙁвестъ сѧ ѳкрѣпѣтъ сѧ самъ L104
ἀπαξιόω – отметатъ прѣобѣдѣтъ L88
βασίλειος (βασίλεια) – полатꙑ къ владѣкамъ L40 / въ полатꙑ L41
βλασφημέω – къмъ хѣлѣтъ S22 / cf. descriptive (βλασφημεῖα)
δάκνω – средѣця досѧщъ вѣлѧкѫ бѣдѫ въпастъ L102
dεινὰ πάσχω – вѣлѧко люто ѳѩтъ вѣлѧкѫ бѣдѫ L104
διαλέγομαι – ѳдѣвъ бесѣдоватъ L86
διανίστημι – вѣбѣсѣтъ вѣстѣтъ (ѹмъ) L90 / (οἱ ἐξεστηκότες)
διαλέγομαι – ѳдѣвъ бесѣдоватъ L86
διανόιστημι – вѣкѣуйдѣтъ вѣкѣстѣй L41
δόκιμος – нескичынъ и слѣкѣй S22
ἐκκλησία – цѣркѡ рекѣшє сѣборъ L41
ἐντίθημι – накаѢатъ и накаѢати L12
ἐξίστημι – вѣкѣпѣдѣтъ и нѣстѣпѣтъ (ѹмѧ) L90 / (οί ἐξεστѣσκότες) ѳўмѣ нѣгъукѣвъ и напрасно ѳукаѧва сѧ S22
ἐπιθυμεω – жѣлѣтъ и жѣлѧтъ S22
ἐπιθυμία – желание и нѣкѣвъ S22
ἐπιμελεία – нѣтѣпѣдѣтъ и нѣкѣпѣдѣтъ L12
ἐπιτάττω – вѣлѣтъ и строитъ S22
εὐδοκιμεω – слѣкѣй и нескичынъ къті L40
ἡδονή – сласть и радость L86
ἡθος – нравъ и обꙑа L22
ἡσυχία – како ти въсе щѹтъ бес плща L41 / велико мѣлъдьнинъ нєтъ и тиєо въсе L90
θρήνος (θρήνων) – слѣзꙑнꙑ плаꙑ]=[†] L41
καθαρός – вєлъко млъан сѧ L86
καταπίπτω – ѹбꙑватъ и ѹбꙑватъ L86
καταφρονέω – прѣобдѣт и небрѣщ L90
κατηγορέω – на нꙑ глаголатъ и сѫждатъ L12
κατορθόω (οἱ κατορθοῦντες) – добрꙑѩ и прѣмꙑѩ L40
κραυγή – кль (v.l. плꙑщь) и мѧтежь L90
κρίσις –ꙁаꙁратъ и сѫдтъ L22
λόγος – ѯмъ и мꙑсль L12
λυω – съкаꙁатъ и раꙁдрѣштъ L40
μακρόθυμος – кротъкъ и трьпѣлвъ L90
νόμος –ѹставъ и стро /ꙁаконъ и стро L12
ξένος – нщь и страньнъ L88
παννυχίς – въстан и молтва L41 / нащих стражемъ бога молѧще S22
παραινέω –ѹтъ и поѹщатъ на добро L86
πενθέω – жалтъ и плакатъ сѧ L86
πενία –ѹбожьство и нњщета L40
πρόνοια – пєаль и трѹдъ L41 / промꙑслъ и стро L40
προσκυνέω – кланꙗтъ сѧ  молт сѧ L88
προστασία – строн и попєенѧдꙑѣю S22
σεσηπότι)–ѹтьль и гнлъ L102
σεσηπότι)–ѹтьль и гнлъ L102
σκανδαλίζειν – прѣрѣсꙗ твортъ и блаꙁнь /ꙁъло срьдьцѹ бꙑтъ и блаꙁнь / (οἱ σκανδαλιζόμενοι) потѧꙃаѭще и блаꙁнѧще сѧ S22
σκοπέω – съмотрѣтъ и блюстъ L12
σκυθρωπός – драбълъ и скръбьнъ L86
σφριγάω – юнъ и тѹьнъ бꙑтъ L12
σφῦρα – кладво L41
σκόπω (ἐν οἴκῳ πεπονηκότι, v.l. σεσηπότι)– οὐσιαί и гνιλъ L102
σιγή – мльан и щѹан L41
σιγάω – мльатъ и не бесѣдоватъ ньсоже S22
στενωπός – стъгна и дворъ L86
συναλίζομαι –ꙗстъ и птъ L102
σφραγίζομαι – въстѧгнѫтъ сѧ  накаꙁатъ сѧ L90
τερπω – краси и гласꙑтъ L12
τιμωρία – каꙁнь и мѫка S22
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Abstract. The Old Church Slavonic translation of John Chrysostom’s commentaries on Acts of the Apostles (CPG 4426) is attested in 18 *ethica* and fragments included in the Old Bulgarian collection *Zlatostruy* from the early 10th-century Preslav. The Slavonic homilies have many peculiarities in common suggesting that they were translated together presumably by one translator. One of their common features is the frequent use of double translations (*Doppelübersetzungen*). In the article nearly half of the 90 examples in 10 homilies are examined and divided into four groups – proper double translations, complementary double translations, synonyms, and contextual synonyms. The study shows that in several cases the Slavonic translation is notably consistent and repetitive, but more often it aims at variety and clarity. The examples from the *Zlatostruy* homilies on *Acts* are compared to other Old Church Slavonic translations (e.g. to the works of John the Exarch and to other homilies from *Zlatostruy*), but the similarities are not sufficient for identifying the anonymous translator(s). The use of doublets in the examined texts is viewed both as a linguistic device for a faithful translation and as a stylistic feature typical for the translator of these homilies. However, this phenomenon is attested in many other medieval literary traditions, which makes the *Zlatostruy* homilies part of a larger textual tradition.

Keywords: double translations, John Chrysostom, Old Church Slavonic translations from Greek, *Zlatostruy*, homilies on *Acts*, Preslav literary school.