ACADÉMIE DES SCIENCES DE BULGARIE
LINGUISTIQUE BALKANIQUE XLV (2006), 2

Olga M. MLADENOVA (Calgary)

ON DAMASKIN GENEALOGY

As a tribute to Kiril Kostov, one of the most inquisitive and astute Bulgarian linguists, this article addresses an appropriately complex aspect of the history of Modern Bulgarian – namely, the nature of the relationship between early Modern Bulgarian literature and the tradition preceding it, based on the older literary language,[1] – and aims to contribute to its elucidation.

The first texts written in Modern Bulgarian did not appear until the early seventeenth century. These are the so-called *damaskins*, for the most part translated literary texts of a religious and didactic nature. They received their name from the sixteenth-century Greek clerical author, Damaskenós Stoudítes (?–1577), who published in Venice in 1557–1558 a collection of thirty-six such texts entitled Βιβλίον ὀνομαζόμενον Θησαυρός 'A Book Called Treasure' (Петканова-Тотева 1965: 6–41). Damaskin collections, however, also could include works by other authors, which were sometimes also attributed to Damaskenós Stoudítes. Meant to be read in church as sermons to the parish, the earliest of the collections that have been preserved consist of miscellaneous texts occasioned by festivals of the Orthodox Church and ordered according to the church calendar (Демина 1985: 27). As time passed, the content of damaskin collections and their function in society changed significantly: the more varied they became, the broader their use with audiences outside clerical circles (Петканова-Тотева 1965: 105–214). The popularity of the miscellaneous damaskin collections continued late into the nineteenth century.

From a linguistic point of view, Bulgarian damaskins form two groups: damaskins written in the older literary language and those written in Modern Bulgarian. The relationship of the two groups to one another is by no means simple. The most detailed textological study of the Bulgarian damaskin tradition concludes that there are four groups of archaic texts and four groups of Modern Bulgarian texts (Демина 1968). The archaic damaskins contain three separate translations of homilies from *Treasure* by Damaskenós Stoudítes (Демина 1968: 42–53). The earliest Modern Bulgarian damaskin homilies stemming from *Treasure* were not translated directly from the Greek original, but derive from a

previous translation of the Greek original into Middle Bulgarian. Both Demina and Petkanova-Toteva see the so-called Sredna-Gora translation as the most important of the archaic translations, in that many Modern Bulgarian homilies have been traced back to it (Петканова-Тотева 1965: 56).

The Tihonravov damaskin, thoroughly studied and published by Demina (Демина 1971), was attributed by her to the first group of Modern Bulgarian damaskins. Demina classifies the homilies included into this damaskin collection into three groups. Some (Nr. 22–30 and 41) are in Middle Bulgarian. The Modern Bulgarian ones were subdivided into homilies that use the adverb of time *тогази* 'then' and reflect an earlier original (Nr. 2–17, 33–38 and 40) than those, in which *тогива* 'then' is used (Nr. 1, 18–21, 31, 32 and 39; Демина 1968: 76–81, 1985: 261).

The reconstructed Proto-Collection I, reflected in the *togazi* section of the Tihonravov damaskin, must already have contained homilies by other authors, also mostly derived from archaic originals, which may or may not have had Greek sources. Borjana Velčeva, for instance, found an archaic version of *St. Mary of Egypt* attributed to St. Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, in BA Nr. 154, a fifteenth-century manuscript from the monastery Neamț in Northeastern Romania and kept now in the Library of the Romanian Academy in Bucharest (Велчева 1996). She concludes that this archaic text is very similar to the one whose Modern Bulgarian translation is included in the Tihonravov damaskin.

My focus here will be on the relations between the fourth group of Modern Bulgarian damaskins and the archaic ones. Was the new translation represented in these Modern Bulgarian damaskins made after a Greek or archaic original? I will base my observations on the eighteenth-century Svištov damaskin, published by Ljubomir Miletič (Милетич 1923), which belongs to the Modern Bulgarian damaskins of the fourth group according to Demina's classification (Демина 1968: 60–63). Demina situates the fourth Modern Bulgarian damaskin group in relation to the other Modern Bulgarian damaskins, and I will take her conclusions as a starting point of the following discussion.

A number of homilies in the damaskin collections of the fourth Modern Bulgarian group come from the same source as their counterparts in the damaskin collections of the first group. Others may either have no counterparts in damaskins outside the fourth Modern Bulgarian group or be present there in a new translation. The new translation is characterized by the use of the adverb of time *тогизи* 'then' and was presumably made at the end of the seventeenth century in a northeastern – Moesian – literary centre (Демина 1968: 220, 227).

To gain a better appreciation of the relationship of the Svištov damaskin and the first group of Modern Bulgarian damaskins, I compared two Svištov homilies with a first-group genealogy (*Elevation of the Cross* and *St. Sabbas*) with their Tihonravov counterparts. The comparison revealed a dramatic difference in

the approach to the protograph: whereas in *Elevation of the Cross* the Svištov damaskin embraces a conservative approach, keeping closely to the text, in *St. Sabbas* it makes many emendations to it. Judging from the eleven-page facsimile reproduced by Miletič at the end of his edition of the Svištov damaskin, several different scribes contributed to the damaskin (Милетич 1923). The different authorship may account for the radically different treatment of the text in the two analysed homilies. Whatever their paths may have been (a matter that deserves further attention), these two texts go back to the same initial translation. Their histories are different, but the genealogy is identical: these homilies represented in the first and the fourth group of damaskins stem from the same source.

Now let us turn to the set of homilies in the damaskins of the fourth Modern Bulgarian group that have no counterparts in the first Modern Bulgarian group. On the basis of the comparison of *St. Mary of Egypt, Epiphany* and *Assumption*[2] in the Svištov damaskin (Милетич 1923: 259–268, 191–197) with the corresponding texts in the Kiev and the Krnino archaic damaskins, respectively (Угринова-Скаловска 1975: 17–30, Илиевски 1972, 2: 49–78, 310–336), it can be argued that the Svištov damaskin includes in this category homilies translated from the so-called Macedonian archaic translation, of which the Kiev and the Krnino damaskins are representative. This conclusion contradicts Demina's opinion, which is based on comparison between the titles of *St. Mary of Egypt* in the Svištov damaskin and in Manuscript Nr. 318 of the Belgrade National Library (Демина 1968: 170). Demina considers that *St. Mary of Egypt* in the Svištov damaskin is not connected in any way with the Macedonian archaic tradition.

My inquiry leads me to believe that the Kiev and the Krnino damaskins, without being the direct sources of the compiler of the Svištov damaskin, yet contain similar versions. In support of this conjecture, I can cite numerous resemblances; and also, besides smaller incongruities, two instances of longish repetitions in the Kiev and the Krnino damaskins that find no parallel in the Svištov damaskin (Угринова-Скаловска 1975: 29 ~ Милетич 1923, 267–268; Илиевски 1972, 2: 72 ~ Милетич 1923: 103). There is also a different treatment of quotations from the Holy Scripture in the Krnino and the Svištov damaskins (Илиевски 1972, 2: 316–318, Милетич 1923: 194–196).

The overall impression, corroborated by a number of facts, is that the Svištov damaskin contains a translation made after an earlier and more precise copy than the one preserved in the Krnino and the Kiev damaskins. I also found some, albeit fewer, errors in the Svištov damaskin that were not shared by the Krnino damaskin. Some fragments, available in either the Krnino or the Kiev damaskins, were eliminated from the Svištov damaskin at a time that is difficult to define: it could have happened before the translation into Modern Bulgarian, simultaneously, or following it. Such considerations place between the Svištov

damaskin on one hand, and the Krnino and Kiev damaskins on the other, at least two intermediary manuscripts.

These preliminary results make it clear that this line of research deserves additional inquiry. In order to gain further insights into the relationship of the fourth-group Modern Bulgarian damaskins with the archaic ones, I compared Svištov homilies with their counterparts in the three known archaic damaskin translations – the so-called Macedonian, Sredna-Gora and Mount-Athos translations (Демина 1968: 34, 42–53, Петканова-Тотева 1965: 48–50) – using as representatives the sixteenth-century Krnino damaskin (Илиевски 1972) for the Macedonian translation, the seventeenth-century Adžar damaskin (БАН 24.4.32) for the Sredna-Gora translation and the seventeenth-century Bucharest damaskin for the Mount-Athos translation[3] (BA Nr. 146). Since the homilies *Annunciation* and *The Birth of Jesus*[4] are included in all three archaic translations as well as the Svištov damaskin, they are an appropriate basis for comparison. Its conclusions are summarized below.

***

First, it appears that the three archaic translations display coincidences of wording that may (but need not) carry over to the Svištov damaskin and require further exploration. The examples below show that coincidences range from the almost literal repetition of entire sentences (as in examples 1 and 2) to lexical reminiscences (as in examples 3 and 4), sometimes (as in example 4) misunderstood by the Modern Bulgarian translator, but nevertheless preserved:

1. И дару́ва му и двана́десеть тѣх си́ли душе́вьны де́то ги има сѣ́ки чловѣкь (Милетич 1923: 75) ~ И҆|дарова̀ е҆мꙋ̀ и҆ двана́десеть си́ль д҃шевныхъ и҆́хже и҆ма̑ вьса́кь чл҃кь (BA Nr. 146: 16) ~ та́же дарова̀ е҆мꙋ̀ два̑ на́|десеть си́лы д҃шевные. и҆́хже и҆ма́ть въса́кь чл҃кь (БАН 24.4.32: 13) ~ и҆ дарова̀ е҆мꙋ̀ два̑надеть|си́лы|д҃шевные· и҆́же и҆́хь и҆ма́ть въса́кь чл҃кь (Илиевски 1972, 2: 11)

2. В' цр'ковнуту писа́нїе три́ и́мета ангельскы сѧ́ наме́рватъ: Михаи́лъ и Гаврїи́лъ и Рафаи́лъ (Милетич 1923: 175) ~ Ꙗ҆́ко вь ц҃рко́вно̑ на́ше̑ писа́нїи, три̑ тьчїю и҆́мена а҆́гг҃ловь ѡ҆брѣта́ют|се, Михаи́ль, Гаврїи́ль, и҆ Рафаи́ль (BA Nr. 146: 12) ~ В ц҃рко́вны̑ писа́нїи. три̑ тьклю и҆́мена ѡ|а҆гг҃лѡ̑ о҆брѣта́ют|се. михаи́ль, гаврїи́ль. и҆|рафаи́ль (БАН 24.4.32: 7ᵛ) ~ ꙗ҆ко|ц҃рко́вныхь|на́шихь|писа́нїи· три̑|тъ́клю и҆́мена|ѡ҆брѣта́ют|се· михаи́ль, гаврїи́ль, и҆|рафаи́ль (Илиевски 1972, 2: 5ᵛ–6)

3. Сеги́ де́то щъ́ да започе́на пръ́вото пи́танїе **и́ща да сме́сѣ** и ше́стото (Милетич 1923: 173) ~ хощꙋ́ присьвькꙋпи́ти (ВА Nr. 146: 6) ~ сьвѫкоуплїо (БАН 24.4.32: 4) ~ хо́щꙋ съвъкоупи́ти (Илиевски 1972, 2: 5)

4. защо́ си́чките виде́нїѧ, де́то ги́ ви́дѣ Даніилъ, се́ архангелъ Гавріилъ ги **раздр'аваше** (Милетич 1923: 176) ~ разрѣша́ше (ВА Nr. 146: 12ᵛ) ~ раз̑рѣша́ше (БАН 24.4.32: 7ᵛ) ~ раз̑рѣши̑ (Илиевски 1972, 2: 6)

The number of such examples can be increased without much effort. They question a key assumption unanimously adopted in damaskin scholarship: namely, that the three archaic traditions are independent translations, each stemming directly from the Greek text. In view of their evidence, the plausible explanation appears to be that these are in fact three revisions (recensions) of a single translation. In other words, the relations between the archaic damaskins are similar in principle to those between the Modern Bulgarian ones of the first three groups, as described by Demina.

This is an important discovery that demonstrates that the Bulgarian lands between the sixteenth and the eighteenth century were a unitary cultural space that allowed free information flow in all directions. It sheds new light on the unanimous interest of Bulgarians in the writing of Damaskenós Stoudítes, who was for them the best-selling author of the period. It has been pointed out before that this interest distinguishes Bulgarians from their Balkan neighbours and from the Orthodox Slavs outside the Balkan area (Петканова-Тотева 1965: 50–51). The old multiple-translation model of penetration of Damaskenós Stoudítes' works into the Bulgarian lands implies a close integration of the Bulgarian and Greek cultural spaces, but disunity and lack of communication inside the Bulgarian cultural space. The new single-translation model evinces a booming cooperation and cultural exchange inside the Bulgarian cultural space, sparked by the absorption of a Greek artifact.

***

Second, whenever the three archaic versions diverge, the Svištov damaskin may agree with either of them. The following illustrations show such cases.

Svištov and Adžar convergence:

5. ети́ ги богъ пріе́ да ги помилова от тѣ́хната **гръ́дость** (Милетич 1923: 173) ~ грьды́не и̑ ра́ди (ВА Nr. 146: 7) ~ ра̀ди грьдо́сти и̑хъ (БАН 24.4.32: 4) ~ за| гръ́дино| и́хъ (Илиевски 1972, 2: 7)

6. Мартїѧ мѣсеца та се зова́ артїе, като́ да рече́шь т'кму (Милетич 1923: 176) ~ Ма́рть ми҃ць парица́ет|се а҃ртїос, и҃ако|же да реку́емь ц҃ѣлыи (BA Nr. 146: 13) ~ Ма́р'ѣїе м҃ць гл҃ю҃т|се. а҃ртїе ре́к'ше тъ́к'мь (БАН 24.4.32: 7^{v}) ~ м҃ць|ма́рть|и҃мен҃ьетъ|се|а҃ртїѡ· и҃ако́|же|съвръше́нь (Илиевски 1972, 2: 6^{v})

Svištov and Krnino convergence:

7. нѣ е́ кри́въ то́й, ами́ бо́гъ, де́то му да́ди **по́другата Ева** (Милетич 1923: 174) ~ подр҃жиѥ ꙗ҃вѫ (BA Nr. 146: 7) ~ подр҃жїѥ ꙗ҃вѫ (БАН 24.4.32: 5) ~ подр҃га ꙗ҃вѫ (Илиевски 1972, 2: 7)

8. Пръ́ви е́ты светы́ Јоанъ Дамаскинъ, щото **повелѣ́ва** въ благословіето си (Милетич 1923: 174) ~ пи҃ше҃ (BA Nr. 146: 7) ~ гл҃ю́[..] (БАН 24.4.32: 5^{v}) ~ повелѣ́ваѣтъ (Илиевски 1972, 2: 4)

Svištov and Bucharest convergence:

9. и оно́зи др'во, де́то разумѣ́ва зло́ и добро́, **су́губу** бе́ши и е́ти (Милетич 1923: 77) ~ соу҃гѹ́во (BA Nr. 146: 18^{v}) ~ (БАН 24.4.32: 15 – lacuna) ~ двои́но (Илиевски 1972, 2: 13)

10. Ами́ да прости́те, оты́ рече́и ма насилиха и излѣ́зохъ во́нъ от скопосатъ на рече́ите, ами́ да до́да да развръза питаніата на́ше (Милетич 1923: 174) – **Нѣ҆** да и҃ма́ проще́|нїе. И҃во сло́во мѝ приндѝ да и҃зле҃зѫ ѿ|ре́да сло́вѹ. ⷭ҃Ва́ше да прїи́дѫ въ разр҃ѣше́нїе и҃ско́мъı на́ши (BA Nr. 146: 7) – ѿва́ше прїи́де́мь разр҃ѣши́|тви възъиска́нїа (БАН 24.4.32: 5) – прочее|же прїи́дѫ|да|ѿвръзѫ въпроше́нїа|ва́шего (Илиевски 1972, 2: 4)

Such a distribution of the divergences and coincidences across manuscripts can only be explained if we assign to the archaic source of the Modern Bulgarian translation of the fourth group an early position in the tradition, one that precedes the three separate recensions whose outcomes we observe in the Adžar, Krnino and Bucharest damaskins. This conjecture is supported by another set of data, in which the Svištov damaskin opts for a variant with counterparts in two of the archaic recensions. Thus, there are examples of coincidences between the Adžar and the Bucharest damaskins that carry over to the Svištov:

11. дѣвица Маріа не бе́ши непричаст́на от грѣхо́тъ Адамовъ (Милетич 1923: 174) – и҃ако д҃ва Ма́рїа не|вѣ҆ непрнусе́тна ѿ|грѣхѡ́ и҃да́мля (BA Nr. 146: 7) – и҃ако

дв҃да Мар҃їамь не|бѣ҃ непринесѣтнаа грѣхъ҃ а҃дамовъ҃ (БАН 24.4.32: 5) – (Илиевски 1972, 2: 4 – sentence omitted)

12. Добрѣ й и за ту́й да речѐмь, о́ти мно́го е́реси се́ повди́гнаха на ту́й и на́й-твр'дѣ от про́сти чловѣцы (Милетич 1923: 173) ~ добро́|во ѥ҃ да и҃|си́е реуе́мь, поне́же мно́гие ѥ҃реси въста́ше ѡ҃|се҃, напа́уе|же ме́жоу про́стъıми у҃ки (BA Nr. 146: 6) ~ добро҃ бо ѥ҃ да и҃|то҃ ре́ци поне́же мнѡ́гїи е҃ре́си въста́ше о҃|се́мь напа́уе|ѡ҃|про́стъı у҃кь (БАН 24.4.32: 4) ~ добрѣ҃|бѣ҃|и҃|се҃|реци· а҃ко|мно́гїи е҃ре́си|въста́ше|ѡ҃|се́мь (Илиевски 1972, 2: 3)

Another set of examples shows the Svištov damaskin agreeing with the Adžar and the Krnino damaskin against the Bucharest damaskin:

13. ами́ **смотри́** на се́тнѣ на довръшваніе годи́ните и време́то да до́ди (Милетич 1923: 174) ~ оу҃строи҃ (BA Nr. 146: 7) ~ оу҃смотри́тъ (БАН 24.4.32: 5) ~ съмо́три (Илиевски 1972, 2: 4)

14. А о́нѣзи четѝрите си́ли нари́чатъ са живот'ны о́ти със тѣхве́и и оживѣ́важ иь се чловѣкь (Милетич 1923: 75)[5] ~ Дрѣги́е|же си́лы уетъıри гл҃ют|се жи́тѣлные а҃ко съ|ни́ми живе́ть и҃ оу҃мир[.]а́ть у҃кь (BA Nr. 146: 16–16ᵛ) ~ Дроу́гые|же си́лы уетѝры гл҃ю́т|се живо́тные. ѯане҃ съ|си́мыи живе́ть и҃|о҃живля́ет|се (БАН 24.4.32: 13) ~ а҃|ѣ́же|и҃ные си́лы|уетѝры· гл҃ют|се живо́тнѣ а҃ко|съ|ни́ми жи́веть и҃|о҃живля́ет|се у҃кь (Илиевски 1972, 2: 11)

Yet another set groups the Svištov damaskin with the Krnino and the Bucharest damaskins against the Adžar:

15. защо́ богъ не се въплъ́ти **без' благове́щенїе а́нгелову** на дѣвица? (Милетич 1923: 173) ~ вез҃ бл҃говѣщѐнїа а҃г҃лова (BA Nr. 146: 6) ~ кро́мѣ бл҃говѣщѐнїа а҃г҃лѡ҃ (БАН 24.4.32: 4) ~ везь| бл҃говѣщѐнїѣ|а҃г҃лово (Илиевски 1972, 2: 3)

16. и҃́шеше **да изба́ви** души́те на́ши от ръцéте дїа́волъски (Милетич 1923: 173) ~ да изба́и҃ (BA Nr. 146: 6ᵛ) ~ свободи́ти (БАН 24.4.32: 4ᵛ) ~ да|и҃зба́вить (Илиевски 1972, 2: 3ᵛ)

Coincidences of linguistic archaisms are especially important for the purposes of this analysis. If coincidences of linguistic innovations can be explained away as independent innovations, linguistic archaisms carry more weight as a proof of the shared origin of manuscripts. In other words, linguistic archaisms can

normally be interpreted as textological archaisms, whereas linguistic innovations shared by a group of manuscripts may serve as a sign that this group of manuscripts has undergone a common stage of revision[6]. Quotations 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9 are instances of linguistic archaisms preserved in the Modern Bulgarian damaskin, doubtless as traces of the archaic original re-narrated and modernized by its compiler. The list of linguistic archaisms that are at the same time textological archaisms can be continued. I will only suggest one particularly clear example, in which the compiler of the Svištov damaskin has chosen to preserve the verb пожрьти 'to sacrifice' unknown in Modern Bulgarian; he, moreover, has kept intact the passive construction, thus displaying a connection to all archaic damaskins, although in closer proximity to the Adžar and the Krnino than to the Bucharest damaskin:

17. яко пасха на́ша за нас пожре́нъ быст Христос (Милетич 1923: 177) ~ Ꙗ҆́ко па́сха на́ша ꙁа́|ны пожре́|се Х҃с (ВА Nr. 146: 8ᵛ) ~ ꙗ҆́ко па́сха на́ша. ꙁа|ны̀ пожрѣ́нь бы҃ х҃с (БАН 24.4.32: 8ᵛ) ~ ꙗ҆́ко|па́сха|на́ша· ꙁа|ны̀|пожре́нь|бы҃|х҃с (Илиевски 1972, 2: 7ᵛ)

Even though shared linguistic innovations may be problematic as proof of the common origin of two manuscripts, their importance cannot be overestimated. Example 16 shows not only a lexical coincidence between the Svištov, the Bucharest and the Krnino damaskins, but also groups them together because of their shared preference for the innovative да construction over the infinitive. This constellation is not isolated. For instance, an impressive series of fourteen infinitives in the Adžar damaskin corresponds to да constructions in the Svištov, the Bucharest and the Krnino damaskins (Милетич 1923: 77, ВА Nr. 146: 18, БАН 24.4.32: 14ᵛ, Илиевски 1972, 2: 12ᵛ).[7] In general, the Adžar damaskin systematically makes more archaic grammatical choices than do the others.

[1] This does not seem a particularly valuable observation at first glance. Modern Bulgarian does not have an infinitive, which limited the options open for the compiler of the Svištov damaskin. However, the compilers of the archaic damaskins could select between archaism and innovation in this case, and their choice sheds light on their ideological stance. They were making available to their audience a Greek author, whose popularity was due at least in part to a conscious choice of language understandable to his less educated contemporaries (Петканова-Тотева 1965: 16–20, 41). It has been claimed that the appearance of the Modern Bulgarian damaskins was itself a response in kind to the challenge issued by Damaskenós Stoudítes. The fact that the compilers of the archaic damaskin versions formed not a unity in this regard but a range with the Adžar damaskin at one end, the Bucharest damaskin at the other, and the Krnino damaskin somewhere in the middle, gives insight into the intellectual processes by

which the Modern Bulgarian damaskins came into being. They can now be seen, not as a clear-cut, revolutionary break with a unitary archaic tradition, but as an attempt to push innovation one step further beyond what was possible within that framework.

The fact that the Sredna-Gora recension, an outcome of the efforts of the most conservative strand of the Bulgarian cultural elite, was at the beginning of the seventeenth century the first to undergo a radical Modern Bulgarian transformation,[8] takes on a new meaning. The archaic damaskin versions more open to innovation were subjected to this process almost a century later. The appearance of Proto-Collection IV, from which the fourth group of Modern Bulgarian damaskins stems, can be seen in this context as a sign of the victory of the radical wing of innovators over the conservatives. This was the moment when the fate of Modern Bulgarian was sealed. The beginning of the eighteenth century became the turning point at which the archaizing approach towards the creation of the literary language definitively lost its position.

***

Let us now consider other characteristics of these groups of manuscripts that come to the fore as a result of this comparison.

First, the Krnino damaskin features an impressive number of errors not shared by the other archaic damaskins at my disposal. I will specifically cite one example only, but number 21 is also relevant:

18. Ето са тѣзи **четирыте** живот'ныи си́ли (Милетич 1923: 76) ~ четы́ри (ВА Nr. 146: 16^{v}) ~ чети́ри (БАН 24.4.32: 12^{v}) ~ четвръ́тые (Илиевски 1972, 2: 11^{v})

Such data corroborate the conclusions based on the comparison between the Svištov, Krnino and Kiev versions of *St. Mary of Egypt, Epiphany* and *Assumption*. They indicate that the complementary Krnino and Kiev damaskins must go back to a better initial source, deteriorated at a date difficult to specify. It seems counterintuitive to assume that the Macedonian recension of which these damaskins are representative was at the same time a deterioration of the protograph it revised and moderately modernized. Modernization was an ambitious task that must have been undertaken by a person of stature, who would have been unlikely to misunderstand his text so often and so seriously. So I would tend to postulate the existence of at least one manuscript generation between the initial translation from the Greek and the Macedonian recension, and another one between it and the

Krnino/Kiev damaskins. A clearer idea of the relations inside the Macedonian group of archaic damaskins will be gained from the comparison of its surviving representatives.

Second, the Adžar damaskin reflects a series of systematic differences from the rest of the damaskins at my disposal. I assume that these differences characterize the archaic Sredna-Gora recension as a whole, but to prove it, I will need to expand my comparative basis to include other Sredna-gora damaskins. Besides featuring the most archaic language of all, the Adžar damaskin also eliminates many passages, especially those that are repetitive or more abstract (see examples 19 and 20). I have identified twenty-three such abridgments in the analysed portion of the text. The addition of words and phrases without counterpart in the other damaskins is much less frequent (see example 21). On the other hand, the language of the Adžar damaskin is not uniformly and consistently more archaic; there are, from time to time, instances that show it taking a more innovative stance than the other damaskins (see example 22).

19. коги́ избере́ добро́то от зло́то **и зло́то от добро́то**, тогї́зи оназе си́ла зове́ са произволе́нїе (Милетич 1923: 76) ~ ѐгда́|же и҆збира́еть добро̀е ѿ|зла́го и҆|зло́е ѿ|до́браго, тогда̀ ѡ҆́наа си́ла гл҃ет|се произволе́нїе (ВА Nr. 146: 16ᵛ) ~ ѐгда гл҃ѥ́ть и҆|и҆ще́ть добро̀е. и҆лѝ и҆збира́еть ѿ зла́го добро̀е. то́гда и҆|си́ла ѻ҆́на, гл҃ѥ́т|се произволе́нїе (БАН 24.4.32: 13) ~ ѐгда|же|и҆збира́е добро̀е|ѿ|зло̀· и҆|зло̀|ѿ|до́брое· тогда|ѡна̀|си́ла гл҃ет|се|произволе́нїе (Илиевски 1972, 2: 11)

20. Заради́ ту́й се то́й прово́ди на слу́жбата съкръве́нному та́йнству. **Скри́ту бе́ши, догде́ не бе́ши ста́налу, явле́ну бы́ заради службата, що́ту и то́й самси́ не разумѣваше на ра́ботата,** ами́ се чю́деши, как ще́ да послугу́ва (Милетич 1923: 176) ~ Сего́ ра́ди ѡ҆́нь посла́нь бы́сть на|слꙋже́нїе съкрьве́ннои та́инѣ. Съкрьве́ннои оу҆́бо прѣ́жде да́же да|боу́деть. ѿкрьве́ннои|же, ѐгда бы́сть вь|слꙋже́нїи, ѐго́|же ни́|же са́мь разꙋмѣ̀. вь|слꙋже́нїи ѐмꙋ́|же и҆|са́мь чюжда́ше|се ка́ко да|слꙋ́жи тако́вои Та́инѣ (ВА Nr. 146: 12ᵛ) ~ то́го ра́ди тъ̀ посла́нь бы̑ въ|слоуже́нїе съкрьве́нном таи́ньствꙋ. ѐго́|же и҆|са́мь чюжда́ше|се ка́ко би̑ послоужи́ль (БАН 24.4.32: 7ᵛ) ~ то́го ра́ди тъ̀и поси́лае се въ|послꙋже́нїе съкръве́ное таи́нс҃то. Съкръве́нное|бѡ|прѣже|ро́жаства· приноси́мь бѡ|ѐга|роди́|се· въ|послꙋже́нїе|е҆́же|ни|тъ̀| разꙋмѣва́ше· въ|ра́ботꙋ|е҆́же|и҆|са́мь|чю́жаше|се· ка́ко| послꙋ́жити (Илиевски 1972, 2: 6)

21. си́рѣчь чу́л нѣкой чи е ли́ѱало слъ́нцето че като не зна́е от що́ е ста́нало туй ли́ѱуване, ту́й са зове́ безслове́сна сла́ва (Милетич 1923: 76) ~ сѝрѣ̀. слыша̀ нѣ́кто ꙗ҆́ко бы́сть помраче́нїе сл҃нца, посе́мь невѣ́сть ѿ|чего́ бы́сть помраче́нїе. и҆ си́е

гл҃ет|се безсловéснаа слáва (ВА Nr. 146: 17ᵛ) ~ си҆рѣ́чь, оу҆слышà нѣ́кто ꙗ҆ко бы҃ ѻ҆скꙋдѣ́нїе сл҃нцꙋ, рéк'ше погы́бель. а҆бїе невѣ́сть чéсо рáди бы҃ ѻ҆скꙋдѣ́нїе. и҆|сé гл҃ет|се безслóвесна слáва (БАН 24.4.32: 14) ~ си҆рѣ́чь|слы́шить|кт҃о|ꙗ҆ко|бы́ти| заграже́нїе сл҃нцꙋ· пото҃|невѣ́сть|ѿ|чт҃о|бы҃|затворéнїе. и҆|сі҃а|гл҃ют|се бесловéсны|слóва (Илиевски 1972, 2: 12)

22. А убонéние е коги́ **мери́ши** чловѣкь нѣ́що (Милетич 1923: 76) ~ оу҆хáеть (ВА Nr. 146: 17) ~ помѣри́шеть (БАН 24.4.32: 13ᵛ) ~ ѡ҆бонꙗ́еть (Илиевски 1972, 2: 11ᵛ)

The types of editorial changes that characterize the Adžar damaskin are evidence of a concern with clarity that, however, excludes interference with the grammatical structure while targeting the flow of argumentation and occasionally vocabulary.

Third, the Bucharest damaskin, which is the only known representative of the Mount-Athos recension, displays the most consistent attempt at modernization in the framework of the archaic damaskins. It is a masterpiece of craftsmanship, and deserves a much more complete textological analysis and perhaps even a separate edition. It has very few errors, although the twenty-seven sheets currently at my disposal have been bound by mistake in the wrong order. The correct sequence would be 1 to 7 (after which there is one sheet missing), 12 to 13, 8 to 11 and 14 to 23. There are other missing sheets between 23 and 24 and a misplaced chunk of text at the beginning of sheet 24, followed by 24 to 27.

These observations make it clear that each of the three archaic damaskins analysed here have passed through their own editorial stages. This justifies the conventional names for the three ensuing recensions, which I will preserve here: the Sredna-Gora recension, the Macedonian recension and the Mount-Athos recension. Further research is needed to decide whether or not any two of these may be considered to have closer connections between them than with the third. At this stage, it looks more probable that if that is the case, the innovative Macedonian and Mount-Athos recensions have more in common with each other than either with the Sredna-Gora recension. The Svištov damaskin is a descendant of the Proto-Collection IV, which included a Modern Bulgarian transformation of a protograph, preceding all three archaic recensions, but not identical with the autograph translation of the Greek text, as that would make it impossible to explain some confusion that seems to point to a less than perfect archaic protograph, sometimes improperly understood. I will only bring two illustrations to support this claim:

23. А чет'вртата си́ла та è похот', си́рѣ́чь да жéлиме за добрó да ни́ се порéвьне отéчество царство небесное кáзувамъ (Милетич 1923: 76) ~ Четвры́таа си́ла

ѥ҆сть жела́нїе. си҆ рѣ҃. да|жела́емь е҆́же є҆ бл҃го́е. да|жела́емь прь́ваго на́шего ѿч҃ьства цр҃ьствїа гл҃ю нбн҃аго (ВА Nr. 146: 16ᵛ) ~ Четврь́та|же є҆ си́ла жела́нїе, ре́кше жела́ти въсе́гда добро̀е. жела́ти пръво̀е ѿч҃ьство на́ше, цр҃ьство нбн҃ое (БАН 24.4.32: 13ᵛ) ~ четвръ́тые|си́лы|сꙋ́ть· жела́нїа· си҆рѣ́чь|да|жела́емь|добра̀а· да|жела́емь|пръво̀е|на́ше| ѿч҃ьство (Илиевски 1972, 2: 11ᵛ)

24. И прь́вата си́ла и́ та е рождесть́вна, си́ре́чь дето са ра́жьда сѣ́ки чловѣк и от небе́то, а то́й го сто́ри та бы̀ (Милетич 1923: 75) ~ И҆|прь́ваа оу҆́бо є҆ роди́телнаа си́ла. си҆рѣ҃. Ꙗ҆́ко ражда́ет|се вьса́кь чл҃кь, и и҆́же не бы́сть, быва́еть и҆ є҆́сть (ВА Nr. 146: 16) ~ И҆|прьва̀ оу҆́бо рождьсть́внаа си́ла є҆. ре́кше ѥ҆|є҆́же ражда́ет|се вьса́кь чл҃кь. и҆|є҆́же не|бѣ̀ быва́еть и́|є҆ (БАН 24.4.32: 13) ~ и҆|прѣ́выи|же|сꙋ́ть рожьстъ́вные|си́лы· си҆рѣ́чь|и҆́же|ражда́ет|се вьса́кь|чл҃кь· и҆|кро́мѣ|да|не|сꙋ̑, бы́тїе|н҃ѣ́ (Илиевски 1972, 2: 11)

All three archaic versions of the text in excerpt 23 are clearer than the Modern Bulgarian one in the Svištov damaskin. It comes closest to the Bucharest version, the only one that provides an equivalent to *ка́зувамъ*. The confusion is provoked by the rendering as simply *оте́чество* 'homeland' of пръво̀е на́ше ѿч҃ьство 'our first homeland', which appears with variations in all three archaic versions. I can propose the following explanation for this choice of wording: if the archaic version that served as a source for the Modern Bulgarian Proto-Collection VI contained a flawed version of a text similar to that in the Bucharest damaskin, but with a neuter form of пръвьнъ for the ordinal numeral (for which see БЕР 6: 70–71, 75), the compiler of Proto-Collection VI could have taken it to be a form of the verb *поре́вне ми се* 'to like, to desire', which he uses in his text.

The least clear of the three archaic versions in excerpt 24 is the Krnino one. The Svištov damaskin, however, offers an even worse reading that makes no sense whatsoever in the second part. One can get an inkling of what might have caused the problem by taking a careful look at the Adžar version, which has небѣ̀ 'was not', written as one word and apparently interpreted to be a form of небо 'sky', which by the eighteenth century must have already taken, in the vernacular language, the form *небе*, broadly used in Bulgarian today (БЕР 4: 581–582).

Texts like 23 and 24, in conjunction with 4, 6 and 14 previously discussed, go a long way towards convincing us that the Svištov damaskin was a product of the transformation of the archaic damaskins, rather than a new, independent translation from the Greek. Comparisons of the archaic damaskins, the Modern Bulgarian damaskins of the fourth group and the Greek original are needed to determine the contribution of the Greek text in shaping the Bulgarian tradition at stages following the initial translation. These comparisons will be the basis for another publication.

At present, we can conclude that: (1) the Sredna-Gora, Macedonian and Mount-Athos archaic damaskin recensions go back to a common source, a sixteenth-century translation from the Greek text of *Treasure* by Damaskenós Stoudítes; (2) an archaic manuscript preceding all these recensions was the protograph transformed at the end of the seventeenth century by the compiler of the Modern Bulgarian Proto-Collection IV; (3) as indicated by Demina, an archaic manuscript of the Sredna-Gora recension served at the beginning of the seventeenth century as the source of Proto-Collection I and later, during the seventeenth century, the same recension provided the archaic protographs of Proto-Collections II and III (Демина 1968: 220).

NOTES

[1] This older literary language is Church Slavonic, and is influenced by Serbian orthographic norms such as the replacement of the nasal vowels by ѫ and ѧ, respectively, or the indiscriminate use of ь for etymological ь and ъ (Демина 1985: 14–15). The language of the archaic damaskins, as well as that of other pre-modern manuscripts identified as forerunners of the Modern Bulgarian damaskins, which may have Bulgarian orthography (Велчева 1996), will be called here, for the sake of simplicity, Middle Bulgarian. This umbrella term reflects the fact that texts in this archaic literary *koine* were written and read in Bulgaria during and after the Middle Bulgarian period of its history, which dates from the twelfth to the fourteenth century, and served as the foundation of the subsequent literary language that arose in this territory, the language of the Modern Bulgarian damaskins.

[2] All three homilies go back to Damaskenós Stoudítes. The Svištov version of *Assumption* ends in mid sentence after the ample discussion of the Old Testament images that conjure and prefigure the Virgin.

[3] I am using the designation introduced by Donka Petkanova to refer to this translation because she is the only scholar known to me who has expressed an opinion as to its localization.

[4] Both homilies go back to Damaskenós Stoudítes. The first one is not represented in the first Modern Bulgarian damaskin group, while the second is.

[5] It is not clear whether the confusion in the second half of the sentence (which should read something like **сьс тѣхь живе́н и ожива́ва се чловѣкь**, a reading that preserves all letters but in a different sequence) is due to a mistake made in Miletič's edition or was indeed part of the Svištov damaskin. If the latter is true, it is an indication that the Svištov damaskin must have had a protograph because such an odd error may only occur in the process of careless copying.

[6] For a discussion of the relationship of textological innovations/archaisms and linguistic innovations/ archaisms see Mladenova manuscript.

[7] Another illustration of an infinitive replaced by a да construction is offered in example 23 below.

[8] I have felt uncomfortable all along using the term *translation* to denote the process of modernization by which the archaic damaskin texts were transformed into Modern Bulgarian ones. Now that we have seen that what the compilers of the reconstructed Proto-Collections I and IV did was not so different from what the authors of the Macedonian and the Mount-Athos recensions did, my reluctance is finally justified. I shall use the term *transformation* for this process.

REFERENCES

BA Nr. 146 = Cuvintele lui Damaschin. Sec. XVII. De la Mănăstirea Neamțul. Biblioteca Academiei. Bucureşti.

Mladenova, O. M. Manuscript. Definiteness in Bulgarian: Modelling the Processes of Language Change. Chapter 4: Language Variation and Textology. Calgary.

БАН 24.4.32 = Ханджарский дамаскин из собрания И. И. Срезневского с прибавлениями из 1686 г. Библиотека Академии наук. С.-Петербург.

БЕР = Български етимологичен речник. София, 1971–.

Велчева, Б. 1996. Ранният славянски превод на Житието на св. Мария Египетска в един ръкопис от XV век. – Palaeobulgarica, 20/3, 30–54.

Демина, Е. И. 1968–1985. Тихонравовский дамаскин. Болгарский памятник XVII в. Исследование и текст. Т. 1–3. София.

Илиевски, П. Хр. 1972. Крнински дамаскин. Т. 1–2. Скопје.

Милетич, Л. 1923. Свищовски дамаскин. Новобългарски паметник от XVIII век. София [Български старини, книга VII].

Петканова-Тотева, Д. 1965. Дамаскините в българската литература. София.

Угринова-Скаловска, Р. 1975. Дамаскини. Македонски преводи од 16 до 19 век. Скопје.

Author's address:
Germanic, Slavic and East Asian Studies
2500 University Drive N. W.
Calgary, Alberta
Canada T2N 1N4
e-mail: omladeno@ucalgary.ca